220.4
W 72

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

220.1 01
W725 e.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

STUDIES IN BIBLICAL LAW

BY

HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FORMERLY A SENIOR WHEWELL SCHOLAR OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

"As a whole, these 'Studies' are of unusual worth. They accomplish for certain Old Testament themes what Greenleaf, Lyttleton, and West did in New Testament lines.... no one will doubt that the author has attempted a most important task and has succeeded well. He has done much to clear the atmosphere where there was overmuch fog. The work deserves to be well known among all students of the older part of God's Word."—*Review and Expositor.*

"It is bold and refreshing . . . . our writer goes over ground trodden nearly two thousand years ago by the sages of the Mishnah; but he strikes out his own line and stands forth much more logical than the old Pharisaic doctors."—*New York Evening Post.*

"There is no doubt that in this examination of the Biblical jural laws Mr. Wiener has opened up a new and valuable source of information as to the dates of the various books of the Pentateuch."—*Academy.*

"....both novel and interesting....The method employed is an ingenious and skillful application of the principles of legal interpretation to texts in apparent conflict."—*Harvard Law Review.*

"In the simplest and quietest way, though with a very firm grasp of the subject, the author shows the impossibilities, and in some cases the real absurdities, of certain contentions of modern criticism; and in our judgment he clearly convicts the writers.... referred to of sacrificing reality and common-sense to matters of philological theory. . . . We recommend this volume to the careful attention of our readers."—*Churchman* (London).

"Altogether the volume is one of great importance and value."—*Bibliotheca Sacra.*

LONDON: DAVID NUTT
57–59 LONG ACRE.

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism

BY

HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

Author of "STUDIES IN BIBLICAL LAW"

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BS
1225
.W6
13,734

OBERLIN, OHIO
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY
1909

COPYRIGHTED, 1909
BY
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

THE NEWS PRINTING COMPANY
OBERLIN, OHIO, U.S.A.

TO
MY MOTHER

PREFACE

The chapters of this book have already appeared as articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1908 and 1909. The first five chapters were published as a series under the title "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism"; the sixth was written as a sequel to that series and retains that character in the present volume. A few slips have been corrected, and the discussion of the clue to the documents has now been placed in its proper position, but no substantial changes have been effected.

It may, I think, fairly be said that the general critical position represented by this volume differs from the positions generally held in two fundamental respects.

First, there is the attitude adopted towards textual criticism. In dealing with writings that have for many centuries depended on a MS. text, the first step must be to use all the available material with a view to ascertaining what the authors actually wrote. In the case of the Pentateuch this precaution has hitherto been neglected. The result is that at the present day Pentateuchal studies are conducted on lines to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in any other field of research. Take, for example, Astruc's famous clue, the use of the Divine appellations in the book of Genesis. As is shown

in these pages, there exists material to prove that in an enormous number of instances the Massoretic text is quite unreliable in regard to these appellations. The publication of this discussion in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* led to an interesting series of notes in the *Expository Times* (May, July, September, 1909). At the moment of writing it would seem that the disciples of Astruc can make no reply to the notes in the July and September issues, and Professor Schlögl's statement in the latter of these, that it is "quite unscientific to determine the analysis of a source by the names of God," has remained unchallenged. Private communications have satisfied me that at any rate some eminent partisans of the Graf–Wellhausen hypothesis are unwilling to attempt any defense of Astruc's clue, and Dr. Volz's reviews of Eerdmans's recent book on Genesis tend in the same direction. It is significant that Dr. Driver makes no reference whatever to the subject in his "Additions and Corrections in the Seventh Edition of the Book of Genesis," although, as the preface is dated August 2, 1909, he can hardly have been unacquainted with it. It may safely be said that in this case silence will not prove an effectual defense against new knowledge.

The lesson taught by the history of Astruc's clue is driven home by other investigations. A number of further instances where a textual criticism that relies mainly on the extant evidence is able to dispose of century-old difficulties will be found in this volume (see especially pp. 114–138). Since it was written I have conducted some inquiries which reaffirm the lesson, and I hope to continue my examination of the critical case in future numbers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and elsewhere. So far as I have gone, I have found the evidence ever more favorable to a view that would attribute the narrative difficulties of the Pentateuch not to a variety of sources but to

the influences that normally operate on every MS. text that is assiduously copied. The only reasonable basis for scholarly work must be a scientific critical text, and the successful formation of that text will be possible only if the principles of impartiality and economy of conjecture are rigorously applied.

The second great *differentia* of my position lies in the view I take of the first principles of all scholarship. For example, I hold that technical investigations require for their successful conduct technical training. Is it possible that in our own days a reconstruction of the history of Israel that rests on a neglect to examine the available evidence and an inability to distinguish between a mound and a house should have found world-wide acceptance? The ordinary higher critic and the ordinary conservative alike would answer in the negative. The critic would say that the question was too preposterous to require an answer; the conservative would regard it as suggesting an idea that from his point of view was too good to be true. Yet if either will be at the pains of carefully studying the sixth chapter of this volume together with the book it criticizes, he will perhaps realize that the answer to the question must ultimately be in the affirmative. Here, again, I know from private communications that when pressed with the main arguments put forward in the present discussion higher critics have no reply; but, so far as I am aware, no public attempt has ever been made on their side to deal with my points.

I cannot close this preface without acknowledging the debt that this book owes to the writings of that distinguished ornament of his University and his Church, Professor A. Van Hoonacker of Louvain. The influence that he has exerted on the lines of my study has been far greater than appears from

the references to him, for it has been of a stimulating and suggestive kind that has usually led me to conclusions differing more or less materially from his own.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

9 Old Square,
Lincoln's Inn, W. C.
29 October, 1909.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTORY	1
THE "CLUE" TO THE "DOCUMENTS"	4
CHAPTER II	57
EGYPT OR GOSHEN	57
THE STORY OF MOSES	60
MOSES AND AARON OR MOSES	64
THE MINISTRY OF THE SANCTUARY	66
THE ROD	70
THE PLAGUES	72
THE SO-CALLED LITERARY EVIDENCE	78
CHAPTER III	82
THE CLOUD	82
THE GLORY	90
THE POSITION OF THE ARK	90
THE TENT OF MEETING	93
THE ANALYSIS OF THE NARRATIVE EXODUS XIII.–NUMBERS XII.	102
CHAPTER IV	114
THE CONCLUDING CHAPTERS OF NUMBERS	114
THE MISSION OF THE SPIES	138
KORAH, DATHAN, AND ABIRAM	143
THE BALAAM NARRATIVE	146
THE OTHER ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES IN NARRATIVE BETWEEN DEUTERONOMY AND EXODUS–NUMBERS	147

PAGE

CHAPTER V 155

THE NUMBERS OF THE ISRAELITES 155

THE WAR WITH MIDIAN 169

CONCLUSION 171

CHAPTER VI. THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF WELLHAUSEN'S PROLEGOMENA 175

INDEX I. (Texts) 227

INDEX II. (Subjects) 235

SKETCH MAP OF THE REGION OF THE FORTY YEARS' WANDERING OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL 115

ERRATA

Page 8, line 19, *for* xxx., *read* xxxii.

Page 17, line 14, and line 1 of the footnote, *for* pronoun, *read* preposition.

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

CHAPTER I.

It is often said by supporters of the higher critical hypothesis at present current in many theological schools that the dominant theories are based on the cumulative effect of a vast body of evidence adduced from many different lines of inquiry, and that, if modern scholarship be worth anything at all, the views of the Wellhausen school must be held to be established beyond all possibility of doubt. These contentions are not entirely baseless, although the truth is very far removed from the meaning of those who maintain them. It is the fact that the higher critics have purported to conduct many different inquiries; but it is also the fact that they rarely succeed in making an accurate statement on any subject that has a bearing on their main hypothesis. Indeed, if accuracy, care, thoroughness, impartiality, be essential elements in scholarship—and we apprehend that we shall find much support for the opinion that they are—these men are not scholars. Let there be no mistake as to our meaning. Nothing is further from our thoughts than to suggest that these writers have any consciousness of their own deficiencies. On the contrary, they are all of them sincerely impressed with the (supposed) excellence of the work done by themselves and their friends. They honestly believe that they are careful, accurate, impartial

scholars, and that those who differ from them are either blinded by theological prejudice, or else unacquainted with the facts, or otherwise incapacitated from forming a sound judgment. As they regard their own laborious achievements, they are filled with honorable pride and admiration, and, believing themselves to be great scholars, they naturally fail to realize that any other view is possible.

Nevertheless, as already stated, we have been led to form a very different estimate of these men and their work. While recognizing the transparent sincerity that inspires most of them, we have found on occasions when we have tested their work that an overwhelming majority of their statements on relevant matters of fact were untrue,[1] and to our mind the vast body of evidence adduced only supplies cumulative proof of the incompetence of those who advance it.

It is, of course, singularly easy to bring these divergent opinions to the test. If we be right in holding that an overwhelming majority of the relevant statements made by the critics are untrue, there can be no difficulty (given the necessary time) in bringing home to them such a body of false allegations on matters of fact as shall suffice to convince any impartial observer of their incompetence. We have on many previous occasions dealt with numbers of their allegations in this way. It is the object of these essays to investigate a further batch of their assertions—primarily those respecting the main difficulties alleged in regard to the narrative of the last four books of the Pentateuch—and the analysis which is based on those assertions. To this end we propose to use a book, commonly called the Oxford Hexateuch,[2] which better than

[1] For an account of some of the causes of this phenomenon, see the Princeton Theological Review, October, 1907, pp. 610 ff.

[2] The Hexateuch according to the Revised Version. Arranged in its Constituent Documents by Members of the Society of Histor-

any other English work represents the position of the Wellhausen school in regard to the Pentateuch, and to deal with the various topics raised in its notes on the narrative sections of the last four books. We shall omit small and unimportant points, and questions which relate to textual criticism rather than higher criticism (so far as these two can be sundered), and we shall supplement that work with other books, especially the volume on Numbers contributed to the International Critical Commentary by Dr. George Buchanan Gray and the commentary on Deuteronomy in the same series from the pen of Dr. Samuel Rolles Driver. The arrangement of the subjects will be dictated solely by convenience. It is not practicable to adhere closely to the order of the commentary, as a single difficulty often affects a group of passages scattered over the Pentateuch; but we hope to deal with every really important allegation as to discrepancies in the narrative of the last four books of the Pentateuch before closing these essays.

To make the inquiry intelligible to those who are not acquainted with the higher critical case, a bald outline of their theory must be given. There were in existence at some time during the Hebrew monarchy two documents denoted respectively by the symbols J and E. Each of these documents must be conceived as the work of a school of prophetic writers rather than as the product of individual effort. A redactor (Rje) combined these documents into a single work called JE, which cannot always be resolved into its component elements. In doing so he selected portions now of one document and now of another, rejecting whatever was unnecessary for his

ical Theology, Oxford. Edited . . . by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby. 2 vols. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1900. Mr. Carpenter writes the Introduction and Notes. A second edition of the Introduction (but without the text) has appeared under the name of "The Composition of the Hexateuch" (1902), and will be referred to where necessary.

purpose, and sometimes writing or rewriting a section himself. Later on, the bulk of Deuteronomy was produced by a prophetical school (D). This was combined with JE, yielding JED, and a Deuteronomic redactor (R^d) gave sundry touches to the extant portions of JE. These constitute the total of the prophetical contributions to the Pentateuch. They extend from the early monarchy till the reign of Josiah or later. Side by side with these is a priestly document (P), which is itself composite. The bulk of it is of exilic or post-exilic origin; but it includes the remains of an earlier code, the Law of Holiness, known as H or P^h. A redactor writing in the spirit of the priestly school (R^p) combined JED with P into (substantially) the present Pentateuch, giving some incidental touches to the earlier documents. Each of these main documents J, E, D, and P, being itself the work of a school, is composite, and should be separated into different strata.

In examining this theory, so far as it rests on alleged discrepancies in the narrative of the first four books, we start with the most important point, the clue to the documents. In all our quotations from the various writers to be quoted we substitute "the LORD" for their transliterations of the Tetragrammaton, a free use of which is regarded with disfavor by Jewish writers.

THE "CLUE" TO THE "DOCUMENTS."

Mr. Carpenter states the critical case with respect to this as follows:—

"The real key to the composition of the Pentateuch may be said to lie in Ex vi 2–8. . . . Two facts of the utmost importance are here definitely asserted. In revealing himself as the LORD, God affirms that he had not been known by that name to the forefathers of Israel; but he had appeared to them as El Shaddai. On the basis of these words it would be reasonable to look for traces in Genesis

of divine manifestations to the patriarchs under the title El Shaddai, and their discovery would afford a presumption that they belonged to the same document. On the other hand the occurrence of similar manifestations in the character of the LORD would directly contradict the express words of the text, and could not be ascribed to the same author. The distinction which Astruc adopted has thus the direct sanction of the Pentateuch itself, and its immediate application is simple and easy. Does the book of Genesis contain revelations of God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shaddai? To Abraham and Jacob, certainly: 'I am El Shaddai' Gen xvii 1 and xxxv 11; but the corresponding announcement to Isaac is missing. Mingled with these, however, are other passages of a different nature, such as the divine utterance to Abram xv 7 'I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees'; or to Jacob xxviii 13 'I am the LORD, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac.' Side by side with these stand many others describing the recognition of the LORD by the patriarchs and their contemporaries. Between Bethel and Ai Abram 'builded an altar unto the LORD, and called upon the name of the LORD' xii 8 cp xiii 4, 18 xxi 33. To the king of Sodom Abram declared that he had sworn 'to the LORD' to take none of the 'goods' recovered from the Mesopotamian invaders xiv 22. Sarai complained to her husband, 'the LORD hath restrained me from bearing' xvi 2. When the mysterious visitor rebukes her for her incredulity, he asks 'Is anything too hard for the LORD?' xviii 14. Lot is warned by the men whom he has entertained, 'the LORD hath sent us to destroy' this place xix 13. But it is not needful to accumulate further instances. The name is known beyond the confines of Canaan. The 'man' in search of a bride for his master's son is welcomed with it at the city of Nahor by Laban, 'Come in, thou blessed of the LORD' xxiv 31. And it is of such ancient use that it can be said of the family of Adam, 'then began men to call upon the name of the LORD' iv 26. But unless the writer of Ex vi 2 contradicts himself, not one of these passages can have issued from his hand." (Mr. Carpenter adds a footnote: "It does not, however, follow that he would never have employed the name in narrative.") (Oxford Hexateuch, vol. i. pp. 33 f.)

In the issue the main division is effected into three documents, the now well-known J, E, and P.

It might naturally be inferred that the critics had succeeded in dividing the early portions of the Pentateuch into three documents in two of which (P and E) Elohim was consistently used to the total exclusion of the Tetragrammaton, while

in the third (J) the Tetragrammaton alone was used. We believe that Mr. Carpenter himself has sometimes come near to drawing this inference, at any rate so far as relates to J, and we must therefore begin by attempting to discover his conception of what the critical case is. On page 98 of his first volume he does indeed say in a footnote, that "when Abraham enters the story, the use of the name 'the LORD' is usually limited to his descendants, though not invariably cp Gen xxvi 28 xxxix 3," but in his notes he puts forward other views. On page 71 of the second volume (note on Gen. xlv. 9) we are told that "the language of this verse is not inconsistent with J except in the use of 'Elohim' which is no longer dramatically appropriate as in xliii 23, 29 xliv 16 between supposed strangers, and may be due to editorial assimilation [i.e. one of the redactors whom we shall frequently meet] cp 1 24 note." The material portion of that note is as follows: "There remains the use of the name 'Elohim.'[1] This appears to be due to the peculiar revision through which the Joseph stories have passed [i.e. a redactor]. The name 'the LORD' does not occur in J after xxxix 23.[2] It might have been expected in xliii 29 (cp xxxix 3 where an Egyptian recognises the LORD's presence with Joseph) cp xliv 16 xlv 9." On the other hand, there is a note on Genesis xxxiii. 5 (p. 51) which is in direct conflict with the ideas underlying these comments: "The occurrence of the name 'Elohim' in 5 and 11 at first sight suggests the assimilation of material from E. But J also uses this name (cp xxxii 28) especially in connexion with those who are (or are supposed to be) outside the close line cp iii 1 xliii 29 xliv 16."

Now the plain meaning of all these inconsistent observa-

[1] Elohim is not a name — but let that pass.

[2] It occurs in xlix. 18, which Mr. Carpenter assigns to a redactor.

tions is as follows: In the abstract, either of two cases is conceivable. There might be an author who used Elohim and the Tetragrammaton either indifferently or discriminating them on some fixed principle: or again there might be an author who uniformly used the Tetragrammaton only. The latter is the case that the critics would prefer. The reason (or perhaps instinct) that prompts them is not difficult to discern. It is one of the suppressed premises of their case that the use of language is throughout uniform, rigid, mechanical. If J can use Elohim as well as the Tetragrammaton, it becomes very difficult to deny him Elohim passages merely because of the use of this term for God. Accordingly Mr. Carpenter, who has noticed a few of the occurrences of Elohim in J (characteristically enough he has not noticed all) makes desperate efforts to invent subtle reasons which would discount the effect of these passages on the minds of his readers.

The whole theory of a division on the basis of the supposed clue afforded by Exodus vi. 3 breaks down completely under examination. We propose to submit it successively to five different tests.

1. It is not, in fact, possible to divide the early portions of the Pentateuch into three main sources (P, E, and J), each of which shall be self-consistent in the use of the designations of God and shall also conform to a uniform practice.

(1) As to P: The Tetragrammaton occurs in two passages of P (Gen. xvii. 1 and xxi. 1b). In both cases a redactor or copyist has to be invoked to get rid of it.

(2) As to E: The Tetragrammaton occurs in four passages of E (Gen. xv. 1, 2; xxii. 11; xxvii. 7b). In all these cases recourse is had as usual to a redactor.

(3) As to J: There are here two separate lines of argument.

(*a*) The discrepancy as to the use of the Tetragrammaton which the critical theory was designed to remove reappears, though on a smaller scale. J uses the Tetragrammaton before (according to J) it was known. His statement is that after the birth of Enoch men began to call upon the name of the LORD (Gen. iv. 26). Yet not only does the Tetragrammaton occur very freely in the narrative of the preceding chapters, but it is actually put into the mouth of Eve, the grandmother of Enoch, long before Seth, his father, had been born. She is made to say, "I have gotten a man with the LORD" (iv. 1). How is this possible on the critical theory? Why is it conceivable that the author of J could do that which, *ex hypothesi,* the author of the Pentateuch could not?

(*b*) As already stated, J uses *Elohim* in many passages, and only a few of these have been noted by Mr. Carpenter. We have observed the following: Genesis iii. 1, 3, 5; iv. 25 (contrast iv. 1); vii. 9; ix. 27; xxvi. 24 (in a Divine revelation where the Name ought most certainly to appear on the critical theory); xxx. 29 (28); xxxiii. 5, 10, 11; xxxix. 9; xliii. 23, 29; xliv. 16; xlv. 9; xlviii. 15 (twice); l. 24. We have seen that in some instances Mr. Carpenter is reduced to postulating redactors, in others he invents brainspun subtleties to account for the word, while his silence in yet others indicates that he has not considered the phenomena they present.

2. An even more serious objection is to be found in the divisions which the critics are compelled to effect in order to carry through their theory. It is one thing to suggest that a continuous passage like Genesis i. 1–ii. 3, or xi. 1–9, or xiv. may be ultimately derived from a separate source; it is quite another to postulate such proceedings as are attributed to the redactors of the critical case. The following instances are limited to those in which the appellations of the Deity are the sole

or determining criterion: in xvi. the use of the Tetragrammaton in verse 2 compels Mr. Carpenter to wrench 1b and 2 from a P context and assign them to J; in xix., verse 29 is torn from a J chapter in which it fits perfectly, to be given to P; in xx. the last verse is assigned to a redactor, though all the rest of the chapter goes to E, and the verse is required for the explanation of 17; in xxii., verses 14–18 go to redactors because the story is assigned to E (a redactor being responsible for the Tetragrammaton in 11). An even more flagrant instance occurs in xxviii. 21, where Mr. Carpenter is compelled to scoop out the words "and the LORD will be my God" and assign them to J, the beginning and end of the verse going to E. What manner of man was this redactor who constructed a narrative on these strange principles? In xxxi., verse 3 has to go to a redactor because the preceding and subsequent verses belong to E; yet that gentleman actually postulates the redactor's work by referring to the statement of 3 in verse 5. However, he receives compensation in xxxii., where verse 30 is wrenched from a J context for his enrichment, though verse 31 (J) cannot be understood without it.

During the later chapters there are no instances, because the Tetragrammaton occurs in Genesis only once after xxxix. 23, so that "a peculiar revision" has to be postulated to justify the analysis during the remainder of the book. It must be remembered further that we have confined ourselves to flagrant cases where the Divine appellations are the sole or determining criterion: there are others where it is one of the criteria (e.g. the assignment of v. 29, the division of the flood story). It will be felt that the critics must have been very hard up for something to believe before they credited such theories as these.

3. The third great objection is alone sufficient to give the

coup de grâce to the whole theory.[1] Unfortunately somewhat lengthy explanations are needed to make it intelligible: but in view of the importance of the topic we must ask our readers to bear with us. We shall show that the text is in many instances extremely unreliable in regard to the occurrences of the Tetragrammaton and Elohim, and that the critics have effected their partition on the basis of a text which is sometimes demonstrably wrong and frequently quite uncertain.

The oldest biblical Hebrew MSS. of which the date is certainly known do not go back before the seventh century of the Christian era.[2] They are therefore not the earliest extant witnesses to the text. Moreover, with slight exceptions, they all represent one official Jewish recension of the Hebrew text.

[1] Our attention was first drawn to the evidence of the Versions in this connection by a notice of a paper by Dr. H. A. Redpath. After working at the subject, we wrote and asked an eminent disciple of Astruc and Wellhausen, how he dealt with the matter. In reply he referred us to an article by Dr. Johannes Dahse, entitled "Textkritische Bedenken gegen den Ausgangspunkt der heutigen Pentateuchkritik," in the Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 1903, pp. 305–319, attacking the Wellhausen theory on the ground of the evidence of the Versions. We have since asked another eminent critic whether any answer has been put forward to Dr. Dahse, and he tells us that so far as he knows this has not been done. Our views have not been materially affected by Dr. Dahse's work, and it does not appear that Dr. Redpath had ever seen or heard of his paper. We have now read Dr. Redpath's paper, which will be found on pages 286–301 of the American Journal of Theology, vol. viii. (1904), under the title "A New Theory as to the Use of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch," and we find that our views differ very largely from his; but this does not detract from our debt to his work for giving us the first clue to the line of investigation here followed. We desire to add that, as far back as 1784, De Rossi pointed out, in reply to Astruc, that many instances of changes of the Tetragrammaton into *Elohim* are found in the MSS. (see his note on Genesis vii. 1, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti, vol. i. p. 10).

[2] Apart from the Nash papyrus, which contains only two short passages. There is a Pentateuch of the year 604 (see Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, p. 617b).

This recension was the work of certain persons unknown (commonly called Massoretes, from a Hebrew word meaning tradition) who lived at some time unknown and were guided by critical principles that are also unknown. They took steps to secure the accurate transmission of what they regarded as the best text known to them, and with such success that variants are very rare in our Hebrew MSS., though, as we shall see, they are not unknown, and sometimes preserve readings that are superior to those of the received text. Textual criticism has therefore to employ other aids in addition to Hebrew MSS., and the most important of these are the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Versions.

The origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch is as follows: At an unknown date some centuries before Christ the Samaritans obtained a copy of the Hebrew Pentateuch. They seem to have edited it, making additions and alterations that were designed either for the purpose of subserving their religious views or else to remove seeming discrepancies, etc. Subject to such alterations (which are easily distinguished), and to such errors as may have crept in as the result of some centuries of MS. tradition, they have preserved the Hebrew text in substantially the original character. There is no evidence that their original MS. was better as a whole than those which were the ancestors of the Massoretic Text, but it may have had some superior readings, and, moreover, the Samaritan tradition, cut off from Jewish influences and preserving the text in a different character, may have remained free from some of the later corruptions of the Jewish text. Hence a reading of the Samaritan is always entitled to careful consideration.

In addition the early Versions are important, and of these the Septuagint is *facile princeps*. It has preserved a very

large number of readings that differ greatly from the Massoretic text, and is regarded on all sides as the palmary aid to textual criticism. The version that stands second to it in importance, though infinitely inferior, is the Syriac, usually called the Peshitto.

In order to estimate the higher critical position properly, it must be remembered that the principle of using the Versions for textual criticism is universally accepted by modern commentators and applied in the other books of the Bible. For instance, in 1 Samuel ii. 1, for the second "LORD," twenty-eight MSS. and the Septuagint have "my God," which improves the parallelism and is accepted by modern critics. It would be extremely easy to multiply instances, but it will be sufficient to refer to the well-known case of Chronicles and its parallels in the earlier books. It is usually the Chronicler who substitutes Elohim for the Tetragrammaton; but in one or two cases he has the Tetragrammaton where our present text gives us Elohim in the earlier books (cp. 2 Sam. vii. 2 with 1 Chron. xvii. 1, and 1 Kings xii. 22 with 2 Chron. xi. 2). No doubt many instances of various readings are to be explained by the desire of late writers and copyists to avoid the Tetragrammaton, but in some cases it would appear that the Divine Name has ousted Elohim from the Hebrew text, as in the passage just cited from 1 Samuel ii. 1, where the parallelism seems to support the variant.

Coming now to the Pentateuch, it is to be observed that the higher critics fully recognize the principle of textual criticism as applied to the Divine appellations when it suits their convenience. (See attempts to apply it by Dr. Gray (Numbers, pp. 310 f.) and Mr. Carpenter (Hexateuch, vol. ii. pp. 109, 225, etc.)) One of the strangest of many strange phenomena in the critical treatment of the Pentateuch is to be found in the

extraordinary mixture of simple, unquestioning acceptance of the received Hebrew text and textual criticism, of knowledge and of ignorance, that characterizes Mr. Carpenter's notes on Genesis. For example, in his margin he notes that in vii. 9 the Targum of Onkelos,[1] the Samaritan, and the Vulgate have "the LORD" for "God." He does not seem to know that one Hebrew MS. also preserves this reading, and that it has a good deal of Septuagintal support. We believe that his only previous recognition of any conflict of evidence in this matter is in the note on ii. 4c, which contains the highly misleading statement that the Septuagint employs "the LORD God" down to viii. 21 and even in ix. 12. This is a fair sample of his work in this matter. How indefensible such a use of the Versions is will appear more fully when we take into consideration the existing material which evidences differences of reading (not merely through the occurrence of the double phrase "LORD God") in an enormous proportion of the occurrences of both Elohim and the Tetragrammaton both before and after vii. 9. Either textual criticism is proper, in which case it should be practised with thoroughness and impartiality, or else it is not, in which case Mr. Carpenter should have left it alone altogether.

Now there is always a preliminary question to be asked in using the Versions. Does the text really represent a different Hebrew? If it be due to a mistranslation or to some desire to give a rendering which shall be clearer than a more literal version, or if again the variant be the result of internal corruption in the Version, it is obvious that it will be of no value for the criticism of the Hebrew text. That this is not the case with, at any rate, the majority of the readings we shall have to consider, is proved by the following considerations:—

[1] Mr. Carpenter probably means the Targum of "Jonathan," as Onkelos habitually paraphrases. See, e.g., Genesis i., where it has " throughout.

(1) Although the divergences of the Hebrew MSS. are (as has been explained) inconsiderable, there are yet a number of instances where there is support for the renderings of the Versions either from one or more Hebrew MSS. or from the Samaritan or from both.

In the following lists we give some variants recorded by (*a*) De Rossi and (*b*) Kennicott in their collations of Hebrew MSS. We have added to these some notes on various Septuagintal readings taken for the most part from the larger Cambridge Septuagint. It will appear hereafter that the readings of the Septuagint present peculiar difficulties. We shall have to make certain suggestions as to the solution of these difficulties at the proper time. For the moment it will be sufficient to notice that there are variations, and that sometimes a Septuagintal reading that has little Greek authority is supported by a Hebrew MS. As we do not read Syriac, we have relied on Kittel's Biblia Hebraica for the readings of this, as also of the less important Versions.

De Rossi chronicles the following variants:—

Reference.	Received Text.	De Rossi.	Other Sources.
Gen. vii. 1.	Lord.	2 MSS. God.	Samaritan, Syriac, God. The best MSS. of the Septuagint, Lord God, with some authority for God only, and Lord only in 1 cursive.
Gen. vii. 9.	God.	1 MS. Lord.	Samaritan, Targum of "Jonathan," Vulgate, Lord; Septuagintal authorities divided between God, Lord, and Lord God.
Gen. viii. 15.	God.	1 MS. Lord.	LXX, Lord God.
Gen. xvi. 11.	Lord 2°.	1 MS. God.	LXX, divided between Lord, Lord God, God.
Ex. v. 17.	To the Lord.	4 MSS. to our God.	LXX, to our God, with some authority for Lord our God.

Reference.	Received Text.	De Rossi.	Other Sources.
Ex. vi. 2.	God.	2 MSS. Lord. 1 MS. Lord God.	Sam. Lord. Some Septuagintal authority (i.e. Lagarde's Lucian, see *post* 3 other Greek cursives including n, and the Old Latin) for Lord.

Kennicott[1] has the following additional variants:—

Reference.	Received Text.	Kennicott.	Other Material.
Gen. ii. 22.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God.	LXX, Lord God, except 1 cursive, which omits God.
Gen. iii. 1.	God 2°.	1 MS. Lord God.	LXX, preponderance of authority for God. 1 uncial and 3 cursives read Lord God.
Gen. iii. 22.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits Lord.	It is known that the LXX originally read God only. Our present MSS. are, however, divided between Lord God and God, while it is said, on the authority of Holmes, that 1 cursive has Lord only.
Gen. xxxi. 53.	The God of their father.	Omitted by 2 MSS.	Omitted by the original LXX.

There are also extant some fragments of a tenth-century Karaite MS., and in Exodus iii. 4 these give the reading "Lord" for the "God"[2] of the Massoretic text. The LXX here also reads "Lord."

(2) A second body of evidence — if more be needed — is contributed by extant notes as to various readings that have come down to us, showing that Septuagintal readings were supported by other authorities. Thus we read that in Genesis

[1] Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus, edidit B. Kennicott, Oxford, 1776.

[2] R. Hoerning, Karaite MSS. in the British Museum, p. 14.

iv. 1, where our text has "LORD," the reading "God," which has the unanimous support of our Septuagintal authorities, was the reading of somebody who could be described as "the Hebrew" (i.e. probably an unknown translator or commentator so quoted [1]) and an authority described as "the Syrian." [2] In iv. 26 the LXX has "LORD God," and this is supported by a note that "the Hebrew" had this reading." [3] In xxx. 24, for the Hebrew "LORD" both our Septuagintal authorities and our Syriac have "God." Now it is known that the Septuagint was supported in this, not merely by the Greek rendering of Symmachus, but also by that of Aquila. Of this scholar very little is known, save that his translation was distinguished by extreme literalness and a refusal to translate the Tetragrammaton at all. He habitually retained the Name itself, and not in Greek but in the old Hebrew character. Hence on this point at any rate no mistake is possible as to the reading he had before him. Further he is supposed to have been a proselyte to Judaism in close touch with the most authoritative Jewish circles of his day, so that a reading of his is extremely valuable evidence as to the best Jewish text of *circa* 125–130 of the Christian era.

For these reasons it is certain that the Versions do, at any rate in the great majority of cases where they differ from the Massoretic text, provide us with genuine Jewish variant readings, and this opens up the question as to the soundness of the Massoretic text with regard to the appellations of God.

It is conceivable that in defense of the higher critical theory it may be asserted that in all cases the Massoretic text is to be

[1] Field, Hexapla, p. lxxvii.

[2] See Field, Hexapla, *ad loc.*, and on "the Syrian," see pp. lxxvii–lxxxii.

[3] See Field, Hexapla, or the larger Cambridge Septuagint, *ad loc.*

preferred. Coming from men who never hesitate to invoke a copyist, harmonist, or redactor to conjure away the facts of the Massoretic text with regard to the usage of the two appellations when their theory demands it, the argument would sound rather strange: but consistency is as little to be expected from the critics as accuracy. Therefore we propose to meet this argument by pointing to some of the readings in which for one reason or another the variant is demonstrably superior to the Massoretic text.

In Genesis iv. 1, "I have gotten a man with[1] the LORD" is impossible, in view of iv. 26. The unanimous reading of the LXX, "God," supported by the note in the Hexapla attributing to "the Hebrew" and "the Syrian" a reading differing from the LXX only in the pronoun, is clearly preferable. It is noticeable that here it is the Tetragrammaton that has for some reason ousted Elohim from the Hebrew text, not *vice versa*.

Genesis xvi. 11 is another example of this. It is certain that the explanation of the name Ishmael cannot have contained the Tetragrammaton, for in that case the name must have been Ishma-*yah*. Ishmael, on the other hand, is of the type of Isra*el* and Peni*el*, and, like these, must have been explained by a sentence containing *Elohim*. Therefore the reading of the MS. which has preserved this, supported as it is by the Lucianic recension of the LXX and the Old Latin, is certainly right.

Similarly, in xxx. 24 the Tetragrammaton of the Massoretic text is less probable than the Elohim of the LXX, Syriac, Aquila, and Symmachus, in view of the Elohim of the preceding verse, and in 27 the Elohim of the Syriac and LXX is at least as probable as the reading of our present Hebrew.

[1] The pronoun is doubtful, but this is immaterial to the present discussion.

On the other hand, there is at least one instance in which something like the converse process has taken place. In Genesis xlviii. 15 the best MS. of the LXX has preserved a reading which, on literary grounds, must be regarded as superior to the Elohim of the Massoretic text. Jacob gives a triple description of Him whom he served, and he does so in terms that necessitate three substantives. Of these, the first (15a) is God (Elohim) and the third is angel. In the Massoretic text the second has been replaced by God. But Codex B of the Septuagint has retained the reading "the Lord" (i.e. probably not the Tetragrammaton, but the Hebrew word lord, which is applied here, as in some other passages of Genesis, to God). And this is clearly right.

Another class of cases in which Septuagintal readings are demonstrably superior to those of the Massoretic text is afforded by certain omissions. According to an ordinary principle of textual criticism the shorter reading is to be preferred in cases where the addition involved by its variant is of such a nature as to be probably explained as being a gloss. It is within the knowledge of everybody that there exist people who will write notes in their books: and in cases of MS. tradition such notes are apt to get incorporated with the text in later copies of the book. Hence there is usually a presumption in favor of the shorter text.

In Genesis xiv. 22 it is for this reason more probable that the Tetragrammaton is the addition of some reader than that the Syriac and almost all the Septuagintal authorities should have omitted the word by accident. So in xv. 2, where the Tetragrammaton (represented by the GOD of the R.V.) is omitted by the Lucianic recension and many MSS. of the Septuagint. In xxxi. 42, "God of my father Abraham," which was undoubtedly the original reading of the LXX, seems better than

"God of my father the God of Abraham"; and in xxxi. 53 "the God of their father" which was omitted by the original LXX, is an unmistakable gloss. So is the word "God" in Exodus iii. 1, which is known to have been missing in the original Septuagintal text. This last gloss has given endless trouble to interpreters. Lastly, a number of considerations combine to show that in Genesis xxviii. 13 the true reading is, "I am the God of Abraham thy father," etc.; but, as we shall have to deal with this passage later in the discussion, we omit the arguments for the present.

The above instances will suffice to show that there are cases in which the Septuagint has preserved readings that are demonstrably superior to those of the Hebrew text, though they do not exhaust the passages in which this has happened. It has also in a number of cases preserved readings that are demonstrably inferior. But in the great majority of variations there are no decisive criteria; for in the great majority of cases the difference to the sense is nil and to the sound indecisive. In writing a history of England during the Victorian age an author might use "the Queen" and "Victoria" indifferently in many cases. The same is true of the Divine appellations in Genesis. Many of the narratives would read just as well with the one word as with the other, and in the great majority of cases where variants exist it can only be said that intrinsically one reading is as probable as the other. It is, therefore, only necessary to show that these variants are extraordinarily numerous to cut away the ground from under the feet of the documentary critics. If it is seldom certain whether the original text of Genesis used God or LORD, it cannot be argued that the occurrences of these words in the Massoretic text afford any presumption at all as to authorship.

The great quarry for variant readings is the Septuagint. But in order to use it critically some sketch of its history is necessary; for its fortunes have been very chequered, and the task of ascertaining its true readings is frequently as difficult as it is fascinating.

It is known that in the fourth century the Greek-speaking Christian world was divided between three recensions of the Septuagint, prepared by Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen[1] respectively. If we had these before us, it would in many cases be possible to argue, from a critical comparison of the three, what the original text of the Septuagint was. It is clear that where they all agreed their unanimous testimony would frequently be above suspicion: where they differed, the causes of the deviation might often be sufficiently obvious to allow more or less certain inferences as to the original. This is the more probable, owing to the known critical procedure of Origen, one of the editors. He observed that there were many instances in which the MSS. of the Septuagint differed from the accepted Hebrew text of his day. He concluded that in all such cases the Hebrew was right and the Septuagint wrong. But the position that the Septuagint had won in the Christian world was so strong that it could not be ousted by any new translation. Accordingly Origen decided to produce a work which should not be limited to the text of the Septuagint, but should also supply the materials for its correction. The result was his famous Hexapla. The bulk of the work was in six columns: One gave the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters: the second contained a transliteration of the Hebrew in Greek characters: the remaining four were devoted to four Greek renderings — those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, as well as the

[1] In the case of the work of Origen, the edition in common use was prepared by Eusebius and Pamphilus on the basis of the Hexapla.

Septuagint. An important feature of the work was the treatment of the latter. Where Origen found that words were missing from the Septuagint which appeared in the Hebrew, he supplied them from one of the other translations; but to make this clear he put the insertions between an asterisk and another sign called a metobel. For example, in Genesis ii. 4 he found that the Hebrew had "LORD God," while the LXX had only "God." In his LXX column he therefore wrote "LORD God," with an asterisk before, and a metobel after, "LORD." This would be understood by his readers to mean "The reading of the LXX as found by Origen is, God; but the Hebrew has 'LORD God,' and the word 'LORD' has therefore been added from another translation to the original text of the LXX." Similarly, if the LXX contained words that were missing in the Hebrew he inserted critical signs (an obel followed by a metobel) to show that these words were only to be found in the LXX.

The ultimate result of these labors was the production of a number of MSS. presenting hybrid texts. Where Origen's recension was copied, his critical marks were frequently omitted. The three recensions — those of Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen (i.e. as edited by Eusebius and Pamphilus) — did not remain absolutely distinct. A MS. representing originally one recension might be corrected from a codex of another recension, or indeed from another Greek translation. The result is that all our extant MSS. represent more or less mixed texts. They frequently differ greatly among themselves, and the recovery of the original Septuagintal reading is a task that is often difficult and sometimes impossible. Moreover it is not certain that these were the only recensions. We have been greatly struck by the fact that a twelfth-century cursive (called n by the Cambridge editors) frequently exhibits a text which

entitles it to rank among the authorities available for the criticism of the Massoretic text, and we think it represents a recension which is not in the main Lucianic or Hexaplar. Attempts have been made to group it with g and (more recently) with d, p and t. In our judgment such attempts break down. In its most excellent and characteristic readings in Genesis it seldom has much MS. support. Possibly it may some day be found that it represents Hesychius, though there are other candidates. If it does not, criticism will ultimately have to concede a fourth important recension. Thus it is necessary to take into account all variants, and judge them on their merits.

We are, however, not altogether without a clue in this task. The view of Origen that the Hebrew text of the day was necessarily superior to the LXX being extensively held, there was a constant tendency to assimilate the Greek MSS. to the Massoretic text. Accordingly it will be an equally constant principle of Septuagintal criticism that a reading which differs from our present Hebrew is more likely to be original (other things being equal). Of course even where the original text of the LXX has been ascertained, we have the further question, whether it should or should not be preferred to the Massoretic text; but that is a distinct question, which is subsequent to the ascertainment of the Septuagintal original.

The materials with which we have to work are as follows:—

(1) Occasional notices have been preserved as to the readings of the Hexapla in particular passages: and sometimes Origen's critical signs have been handed down. The great bulk of these are to be found in Field's Hexapla, but a little additional material can be obtained from the larger Cambridge Septuagint.

(2) It was observed that certain readings which were known from other sources to have been distinguishing readings

of Lucian's recension were exhibited by certain cursive MSS. It was therefore inferred that these MSS. preserved the Lucianic text in a more or less pure form, and P. de Lagarde undertook the task of producing an edition of "Lucian." His work,[1] unfortunately, never went beyond the first volume; but that of course covers the books that are important for our present purpose and often gives readings that are extremely valuable. The main defect of the book is the absence of information as to the readings of the MSS. and other sources used by Lagarde. This makes it impossible to control his views as to the original text. It is plain from the larger Cambridge Septuagint, which contains the readings of some (but unfortunately not all) of Lagarde's MSS., that in the matter of the designations of God he sometimes had to choose between different readings. He has undoubtedly chosen rightly in some instances, but who shall say that his judgment was never at fault?

(3) In addition to the above information as to special re-

[1] Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars Prior Graece, Göttingen, 1883. Dahse has lately argued that the MSS. regarded as Lucianic are not in fact the best representatives of Lucian's work in Genesis, and do not contain a distinct recension (Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (1908), vol. xxviii. p. 19). The readings hereafter quoted are incompatible with the latter contention. Dahse's reasoning appears to us extremely weak, and his main ground for arguing that a different group of MSS. (the f, i, r of the Cambridge Septuagint) represents Lucian is a note ΔΕ in the margin of a MS. referring to a reading in xix 2. He first changes this to ΛΕ, and then interprets it as Lucian's edition (Λουκιανου Εκδοσις). That is probably right; but he has overlooked the fact that Lagarde has this reading as the result of an examination of the Lucianic MSS. Thus his only important evidence that the group f, i, r is Lucianic is not a test that excludes the bulk of the MSS. on which Lagarde relied. Such a reading as that in Gen. xvi. 11 proves beyond a peradventure that Lagarde's MSS. have preserved a distinct and most valuable version where f, i, r are at fault. Moreover, Lagarde appears to have used evidence for his edition that has not been employed by Dahse.

censions, we have a large number of MSS. and translations from the LXX. By far the best edition of the LXX for those who have to consult these is the larger Cambridge edition, of which, at the time of writing, Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus only have appeared.[1] It contains the readings of all the uncials, thirty selected cursives, and the ancient Versions from the Septuagint that are of textual importance. It also gives the readings of church fathers who quote the LXX, but these are frequently valueless for our special purpose, and need not be considered. (In view of the statement that the Ethiopic Version is a very free translation, we shall not generally quote this.) Lastly, it reports some additional readings of other MSS. given in the earlier edition of Holmes; but, as this book does not enjoy a first-rate reputation for accuracy, these readings can be used only with some reserve.

After this lengthy introduction it is possible to arrive at some principles which may guide us in the use of the Septuagintal material.

(1) Where all the available Septuagintal authorities are agreed in reading either "LORD" for a Hebrew "God" or "LORD God," or in reading "God" for a Hebrew "LORD" or "LORD God," we may be certain that they have preserved the original reading of the LXX. (It will presently appear that this inference is not equally certain where they all agree on "LORD God.")

(2) Where the facts are as in (1), save that some of the Septuagintal authorities support the Hebrew while the variant is supported by strong Septuagintal authority, the variant will be the original reading of the LXX.

[1] The Old Testament in Greek, edited by Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean, Vol. I, The Octateuch, Part i. Genesis, Cambridge, 1906, Part ii. Exodus and Leviticus, Cambridge, 1909.

(3) Where it is definitely known that Origen altered the text to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew, the unaltered text will be the original reading, even if all or most of our other Septuagintal authorities support the Hebrew.

(4) Where Lucian alone has "God" for a Hebrew "LORD" or "LORD" for a Hebrew "God," his text represents an original Hebrew variant; though not necessarily the original text of the LXX.

Other canons will emerge as the inquiry proceeds: for the present we desire to exemplify these in a simple manner. In the following table we set out those readings in Genesis ii.–iii. for which Hexaplar information is available.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Reading of the best extant MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. ii. 4.	Lord God.	Lord God.	God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	1 cursive (g) omits God. All the other authorities are divided between Lord God and God, n reading God.
Gen. ii. 5.	Lord God.	God.	Lord God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	5 cursives support the Hebrew. The Armenian also reads Lord God; but some of its MSS. have preserved Origen's critical marks. The rest of the authorities (including n) preserve God.
Gen. ii. 7.	Lord God.	God.	God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	Some MSS. read Lord God. But the great preponderance of authority (including n) is for God alone.
Gen. ii. 8.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	About 12 cursives (including n) omit Lord, with some support from versions.
Gen. iii. 1.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Septuagintal authorities unanimous.
Gen. iii. 22.	Lord God.	Lord God.	God.		Origen's asterisk found in the margin of an uncial showing that he added Lord. Authorities divided between the 2 readings (n supporting God). 1 cursive of Holmes apparently reads Lord only.
Gen. iii. 23.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord added.	1 cursive (b) omits God.

These comparisons are very instructive. In one of the seven instances Origen appears to have found "LORD God," and this is supported by all our authorities. In the remaining six, what he regarded as the true Septuagintal text had "God" alone, and he added "LORD" to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew. In one instance all trace of the original reading has vanished from all our other Septuagintal authorities: in the other cases they divide, but not on any uniform principle. On three occasions Lucian is right, on two occasions the best MS. In all five, n has preserved the right reading. No definite rule can be laid down as to the probable source of the best readings. It can only be said that *no* information can be safely neglected. Consequently where the Hexapla fails us we must compare all our other information.

But it may be asked, What do the higher critics say to this? Would they approve of such methods? Let the following facts be considered:—

There passes, under the name of Dr. S. R. Driver, a volume entitled "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel" dated 1890. On pages lii f. the following passage will be found:—

"But what imparts to Lucian's work its great importance in the criticism of the O.T., is the fact that it embodies renderings, not found in other MSS. of the LXX, which presuppose a Hebrew original self-evidently superior in the passages concerned to the existing Massoretic text. Whether these renderings were derived by him from MSS. of the LXX of which all other traces have disappeared, or whether they were based directly upon Hebrew MSS. which had preserved the genuine reading intact, whether in other words they were derived mediately or immediately from the Hebrew, is a matter of subordinate moment: the fact remains that Lucian's recension contains elements resting ultimately upon Hebrew sources which enable us to correct, with absolute certainty, corrupt passages of the Massoretic text. . . . The full gain from this quarter is in all probability not yet exhausted. . . . 'Let him who would himself investigate and advance learning, by the side of the other Ancient Ver-

sions, accustom himself above all things to the use of Field's Hexapla, and Lagarde's edition of the Recension of Lucian' (Klostermann)."

There also passes, under the name of Dr. S. R. Driver, a volume entitled "The Book of Genesis, with Introduction and Notes," and the first edition bears date 1904 — i.e. long after the volume on Samuel. Naturally when we come to ii. 4 we find a note on "LORD God." Has any attempt been made, either here or in any other passage where they throw light on the appellations of God, to use either Field's Hexapla or Lagarde's Lucian? No. Instead, we read, "It is usually supposed that in ii. 4b–iii. 24 the original author wrote simply *Lord:* and that *God* was added by the compiler, with the object of identifying expressly the Author of life of ii. 4b–25 with the Creator of ch. 1." Would Dr. Driver (and when we say Dr. Driver we include the author or authors, source or sources, redactor or redactors, if any, of this note) have supposed anything of the kind, if he had been aware that the LXX here read "God" only at a date long subsequent to that of the supposititious compiler?

In Mr. Carpenter's Hexateuch there is a note on the passage in which the "God" of the Hebrew text is assigned to the compiler, and we read that "Klostermann has suggested that it was an instruction to the reader, when i 1–iii 24 was regarded as one section, to pronounce the same divine name (*Elohim*) throughout." Klostermann is the author of the impressive exhortation quoted in the "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel," "above all things" to use Field's Hexapla and Lagarde's Lucian. Why do not the higher critics practise what they preach?

The evidence as to the remaining cases in ii. and iii. where the Massoretic text has "LORD God" is as follows:—

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Other Information.
Gen. ii. 9.	Lord God.	God.	God.	2 cursives and the Armenian insert Lord. All other authorities (including n), God.
Gen. ii. 15.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	1 cursive of Holmes omits Lord.
Gen. ii. 16.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	1 cursive (f) and the Sahidic omit Lord.
Gen. ii. 18.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	2 cursives omit Lord.
Gen. ii. 19.	Lord God.	God.	God.	Lord inserted by about 2 cursives and the Armenian and Sahidic. All other authorities, God.
Gen. ii. 21.	Lord God.	God.	God.	4 cursives and the Armenian insert Lord. 1 cursive (h) reads Lord. All other authorities, God.
Gen. ii. 22.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	1 cursive omits God.
Gen. iii. 8 1°.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	1 cursive (m) omits God.
Gen. iii. 8 2°.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	1 uncial (E) and n and the Bohairic omit Lord.
Gen. iii. 9.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	2 cursives (b, y) and the Palestinian omit Lord. 1 uncial (L) omits God.
Gen. iii. 13.	Lord God.	Lord God.	God.	Lord omitted by 1 uncial (L), 12 cursives, the Bohairic and the Palestinian. All other authorities, Lord God.
Gen. iii. 14.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	2 cursives (e, o) omit Lord.
Gen. iii. 21.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Some MSS. of the Armenian omit Lord. 1 cursive of Holmes omits God.

The evidence is absolutely clear as to ii. 9, 19, 21, and iii. 13. In these cases the original LXX had God only. It would be premature to express any opinion on the other variants before considering the independent support that Septuagintal readings with very slight authority sometimes obtain from other

sources, but for those who know how often n alone preserves a text that is superior to that of all other Septuagintal authorities, there can be very little doubt about iii. 8 2°.

On pages 31–35 we give a select list of variant readings from Genesis iv. onwards:—

Probably few will doubt that in the great majority of the passages cited in this table the LXX originally had a reading that differed from our present Massoretic text. But there is other material which can be utilized. We have seen that in one passage an addition that is known to have been made by Origen has been embodied in all our authorities. We have also seen enough to show that no certain rule can be laid down as to what authorities will contain variants. It is always possible that one or more MSS. will detach themselves from the general body and present a reading that is independent of that of most of their compeers. Moreover there are an enormous number of passages where "LORD God" is evidently a "conflate" reading, i.e. a reading that has been produced by the amalgamation of two readings "LORD" and "God." Sometimes both these earlier readings are found in Septuagintal authorities: sometimes one is represented only by the Massoretic text or some other witness: sometimes a conflate Septuagintal reading is represented by two other readings in extant sources. In these circumstances we are of opinion that two other canons may be framed for dealing with the Septuagintal evidence as to the Divine appellations.

(5) A reading that has very little Septuagintal authority often represents an original Hebrew variant.

(6) A conflate Septuagintal reading frequently goes back to varying Hebrew readings sometimes through a conflate Hebrew text. The process of mixing two readings had sometimes

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. iv. 1.	Lord.	God.	God.	Origen's LXX, "the Hebrew," and "the Syrian," God; Symmachus and another (anonymous) translator, Lord	Unanimous.
Gen. iv. 3.	Lord.	Lord.	Lord.		1 uncial, 2 cursives, the Armenian and Sahidic, God; 1 cursive, Lord God; rest, Lord.
Gen. iv. 4.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. iv. 9.	Lord.	God.	God.		1 other uncial and about 9 cursives (including n), God; rest, Lord God.
Gen. iv. 16.	Lord.	God.	God.		1 cursive (f), Lord God. All other authorities, God.
Gen. vi. 6.	Lord.	God.	God.	LXX, God. Aquila, Lord.	About 9 cursives, Lord God. All others, God.
Gen. vi. 7.	Lord.	God.	God.		About 9 cursives and 2 versions, Lord God. 1 version omits. All others (including n), God.
Gen. viii. 20.	Lord.	God.	Lord.		1 uncial (L) and about 14 cursives, Lord. Two cursives (f, n) and the Sahidic, Lord God; rest, God.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. ix. 16.	Between God.	Between me.	Between me.		About 5 cursives, God; rest, me.
Gen. xii. 17.	Lord.	God.	Lord.	L X X, God (other copies, Lord).	Authorities divided between Lord, Lord God, and God, (which is read by n).
Gen. xiii.10 1°.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xiii. 10 2°.	Lord.	God.	God.		1 cursive, Lord; rest, God.
Gen. xiii. 13.	Lord.	God.	God.		No important variations of certainty.
Gen. xiii. 14.	Lord.	God.	God.		2 uncials, 9 cursives, the Bohairic, Lord; Old Latin, Lord God; all others (including n), God.
Gen. xiv. 22.	Lord.	Omitted.	Omitted.		Two cursives only insert Lord. Syriac also omits.
Gen. xv. 2.	lord God.	lord God.	lord.		Most authorities divided fairly evenly between Lord God and lord. 1 uncial (L) omits the whole phrase. 1 cursive and the Sahidic omit lord.
Gen. xv. 4.	Lord.	Lord.	God.		7 cursives, the Armenian and Sahidic, God; 6 cursives and Old Latin omit Lord.
Gen. xv. 6.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xv. 7.	Lord.	God.	God.		1 cursive and the Armenian prefix Lord; all others, God.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. xv. 18.	Lord.	God.	Lord.		3 cursives support God; all other authorities divided between Lord and Lord God.
Gen. xvi. 5.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xvi. 11 2°.	Lord.	Lord.	God.		2 cursives (one of which, called by the Cambridge editors b, is one of Lagarde's Lucianic MSS. and the other of which (w) appears also to be Lucianic though apparently collated for the first time for the larger Cambridge Septuagint), and Old Latin, God; all others, Lord.
Gen. xviii. 1.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xviii. 14.	Lord.	God.	Lord.		All authorities, God, except b, w, which have Lord.
Gen. xix. 29 1°.	God.	Lord.	God.		9 cursives and the Palestinian, God; E omits altogether; all other authorities, Lord.
Gen. xix. 29 2°.	When he overthrew.	When the Lord overthrew.	[The Lord.]		3 cursives (f, b, w) omit the Lord; 1 uncial (E) reads Lord God; all others, Lord.
Gen. xx. 18.	Lord.	Lord.	God.		4 cursives (including b, w) and the Bohairic, God; a cursive of Holmes omits; all others, Lord; the Samaritan also reads God.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. xxi. 2.	God.	Lord.	Lord.		Armenian, God; many cursives, Lord God.
Gen. xxi. 4.	God.	God.	Lord.		5 cursives (including b, w), Lord; about 8 cursives and the Armenian, Lord God; rest, God.
Gen. xxi. 17 2°.	God.	God.	Lord.		6 cursives (including b, w), Lord; 1 cursive, Lord God; rest, God.
Gen. xxv. 21 2°.	Lord.	God.	God.		1 uncial and 1 cursive (f), Lord; all others, God.
Gen. xxviii. 13 2°.	Lord.	Omits.	Omits.	LXX, God (i.e. God of Abraham); other copies, Lord the God.	About 12 cursives, the Armenian and Sahidic add Lord; Old Latin, Lord, omitting God.
Gen. xxx. 24.	Lord.	God.	God.	Aquila, Symmachus, and LXX, God.	Unanimous. Syriac agrees with LXX.
Gen. xxx. 27.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous. Syriac agrees with LXX.
Gen. xxxi. 42.	God of Abraham.	Omits God.	Omits God.	Origen inserted God.	6 cursives and Armenian insert God; all others omit.
Gen. xxxi. 49.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xxxi. 53.	The God of their father.	Omits.	Omits.	Inserted by Origen.	A few MSS. and versions insert in varying forms.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. xxxv. 9.	Nothing.	Adds God at end of the verse.	Adds God.	Origen found God, and obelized it.	Only 1 cursive (o) omits God; rest, unanimous; Samaritan adds God.
Gen. xxxviii. 7 2°.	Lord.	God.	God.		Only 1 cursive, Lord; rest, unanimous.
Gen. xxxviii. 10.	Lord.	God.	God.		Old Latin, Lord; 3 cursives, Lord God; rest, unanimous.
Gen. xlviii. 15 2°.	God.	lord.	God.		All others, God.
Ex. iii. 1.	God.	Omits.	God.	LXX omits, but other copies insert, God.	About 2 uncials and 19 cursives, the Armenian, Old Latin and Syriac, God.
Ex. iii. 4 2°.	God.	Lord.	Lord.		2 cursives (n, p) omit; rest, Lord.
Ex. iii. 12.	And (he said).	And God.	And the Lord.	LXX, and God said; other copies, and he said.	1 cursive (f) originally omitted; 6 (including Lucianic) cursives and Old Latin, Lord; 1 cursive of Holmes, Lord God.

been performed in the Hebrew originals from which the LXX was translated.

The following table shows a number of cases where Septuagintal variants with very little authority are supported by extant variants either in Kennicott's collations or in the Samaritan Pentateuch of Blayney's edition.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Variants.	Septuagintal Evidence.
Gen. ii. 18.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God; 1 MS. omits Lord.	2 cursives (e, c_2) omit Lord.
Gen. ii. 21.	Lord God.	2 MSS. omit God.	1 cursive (h) reads Lord.
Gen. ii. 22.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God.	1 cursive (y) omits God.
Gen. iii. 1.	God 2°.	1 MS. Lord God.	1 uncial (E), 3 cursives, Lord God; 1 cursive of Holmes, Lord only.
Gen. iii. 22.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits Lord.	Lord omitted by 1 uncial (M), numerous cursives and Palestinian Aramaic. It is known to have been added here by Origen.
Gen. iii. 23.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God.	1 cursive (b) omits God.
Gen. v. 22.	With God.	1 MS. omits.	1 cursive of Holmes omits. There are other variants.
Gen. vi. 5.	Lord.	1 MS. God.	Lord God. 1 cursive of Holmes, God.
Gen. vi. 13.	God.	1 MS. Lord (in abbreviated form JH) God.	1 uncial (D), 14 cursives Armenian, Sahidic, Syriac, Lord God; 1 cursive (n), Lord.
Gen. vii. 1.	Lord.	2 MSS.[1] and Sam. God.	Lord God. 2 cursives (c, w) (with some Armenian support), God; 1 cursive (k), Lord.
Gen. vii. 9.	God.	1 MS. and Sam. Lord.	1 uncial (M), 4 cursives, Armenian, and Bohairic, Lord God; 1 uncial (E) Lord.

[1] See Kennicott, *ad loc.;* also his addenda on page 119.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Variants.	Septuagintal Evidence.
Gen. vii. 16.	God.	1 MS. Lord.	1 uncial (E) and about 13 cursives, Lord God; 2 uncials (D, M), Bohairic, with some Sahidic support, Lord.
Gen. xv. 2.	lord God.	3 MSS. Lord God; 1 MS. God.	1 cursive (a), Sahidic, Tetragrammaton only. Much authority for lord only.
Gen. xv. 8.	Lord God.	3 MSS.[1] Lord God; 2 MSS. God only.	Sahidic, Lord God; 2 cursives (b, w) lord, God, God.
Gen. xvii. 15.	God.	1 MS. Lord.	2 cursives (b d_2), Lord God; Latin, Lord.
Gen. xviii. 33.	Lord.	1 MS. omits.	1 cursive (c_2) omits.
Gen. xix. 29.	God 1°.	1 MS. Lord.	Lord, 9 cursives, Palestinian, God. 1 uncial (E) omits altogether.
Gen. xxviii. 4.	God.	Sam. Lord.	1 uncial (E), 1 cursive (f), Lord God.
Gen. xxx. 22.	God 2°.	2 MSS. omit.	2 cursives (e, n), omit; Latin, Lord God.
Gen. xxxv. 9.	God 1°.	1 MS. omits.	1 cursive (b) omits.
Gen. xxxv. 10.	God.	1 MS. God Lord. 1 MS. omits.	Ordinary reading, God; but D, 5 cursives, and the Sahidic omit.

These coincidences are too numerous to be due to chance, and it must be admitted that in every case where any Septuagintal authority presents a reading that differs from the Massoretic text without any reason for supposing that the variant originated in the Greek, there is prima-facie evidence for suspecting that a Hebrew variant once existed.[2] Readings, whether He-

[1] See Kennicott, *ad loc.;* also his addenda on page 119.

[2] It may be remarked that there are also variants evidenced by the Samaritan, the Syriac, or a Hebrew source in cases where the LXX supports the Massoretic text, e.g. xxii. 15 (Rje), M. T. Lord, Syr. God; xxxi. 7 (E) M. T. God, Sam. Lord; 9 (E) M. T. God, Sam.

brew or Greek, showing "LORD God," naturally rouse the suspicion that they are conflate, and that at one period two Hebrew readings were extant, one having "LORD" and the other "God," though, owing to the abbreviations used in both languages, they may sometimes be due to dittography.[1] We think that the tables we have already printed are amply sufficient to dispose of the higher critical case on the appellations of God; but, in order to make it quite clear how frequently the reading is precarious, we propose to print all the variants of any consequence in a couple of selected passages. The higher critics hold that J and E are not always distinguishable from each other: but P is said to possess such well-marked characteristics that doubt is seldom possible as to his authorship. Accordingly we begin with Genesis vi. 9–xi. 17 — the story of the flood. In giving the Septuagintal evidence we in all cases set out the reading of the best MS. first.

REFERENCE.	SOURCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT	SEPTUAGINT.
Gen. vi. 11.	P.	God.	God; about 4 cursives and the Sahidic, LORD God.
Gen. vi. 12.	P.	God.	LORD God; 2 cursives, God; 1 cursive, LORD.
Gen. vi. 13.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 14 cursives, Armenian, Sahidic, and Syro-hexaplar LORD God; 1 cursive (n) LORD (as before stated there is a Hebrew variant, LORD God).
Gen. vi. 22.	P.	God.	LORD God; 1 uncial, about 16 cursives (including n) and the Palestinian, God.

and 1 Heb. MS. LORD; 16 (E) M. T. God 1°, Sam. LORD; M. T. God 2°, Syr. LORD; xlv. 5 (E) M. T. God, 2 MSS. LORD; 7 (E) M. T. God, 2 MSS. LORD. The MSS. are Kennicott's.

[1]Again glosses may be responsible in some passages.

Reference.	Source.	Massoretic Text.	Septuagint.
Gen. vii. 1.	J.	Lord.	Lord God; 2 cursives and some MSS. of the Armenian, God; 1 cursive, Lord (as stated before, there is Samaritan, Syriac, and Hebrew evidence for God).
Gen. vii. 5.	J.	Lord.	Lord God; 1 cursive, God; 1 cursive and the Sahidic, Lord.
Gen. vii. 9.	J.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 4 cursives, the Armenian and Bohairic, Lord God; 1 uncial, Lord (as stated before there is Samaritan, Latin (Vulgate), and Hebrew evidence for Lord).
Gen. vii. 16a.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial and about 13 cursives, Lord God; 2 uncials, the Bohairic, and some evidence from the Sahidic, Lord (as already stated there is Hebrew evidence for Lord).
Gen. vii. 16b.	J.	Lord.	Lord God; 1 uncial, God; Bohairic, Lord.
Gen. viii. 15.	P.	God.	Lord God.
Gen. viii. 20.	J.	Lord.	God; 2 cursives (f, n) and Sahidic, Lord God; 1 uncial and about 14 cursives, Lord.
Gen. viii. 21a.	J.	Lord.	Lord God; Origen obelized God. It is omitted by 1 uncial and about 5 cursives.
Gen. viii. 21b.	J.	Lord.	Lord God; Sahidic, God. Origen found Lord God and obelized God.
Gen. ix. 1.	P.	God.	God; 2 cursives and the Sahidic, Lord God.
Gen. ix. 8.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 4 cursives, Armenian and Sahidic, Lord God; one of these cursives (f) originally had Lord only.
Gen. ix. 12.	P.	God.	Lord God; 1 uncial, God. 1 cursive, Lord.
Gen. ix. 17.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 6 cursives, and some Armenian MSS. Lord God; 1 cursive, Lord.

The only subsequent passages of any length assigned to P are chapters xvii. and xxiii. The latter does not contain any Divine appellation. The variants of any consequence in the former are as follows:—

Reference.	Source.	Massoretic Text.	Septuagint.
Gen. xvii. 1a.	P.	Lord.	Lord; 1 cursive and the Armenian, Lord God.
Gen. xvii. 15.	P.	God.	God; 2 cursives, Lord God; Old Latin, Lord (as already stated there is Hebrew evidence for Lord).
Gen. xvii. 18.	P.	Nothing.	1 cursive adds Lord at the end of the verse.
Gen. xvii. 19.	P.	God.	God; 1 cursive, Lord.

When to these are added the variants that have already been set out in other passages of P where any Divine appellation is used (Gen. xix. 29; xxi. 2, 4; xxviii. 4; xxxv. 10), it will be seen that for sheer worthlessness as a test of authorship the use of the Divine appellations by the Massoretic text would be difficult to surpass.

With regard to J and E the facts are of course similar. While the witnesses are not unanimous, the preponderance of evidence certainly favors *Elohim* alone as the original reading of Genesis ii., iii.; and on the whole iv. 26 is favorable to this conclusion. It is true that there are a number of Hebrew variants in these chapters giving the reading "Lord" only. Of these we can say only, that they do not seem to have been regarded as the best reading by any well-recognized Hebrew authority. But with this matter we are not here concerned. Our business is not to produce a critical edition of the Hebrew text of Genesis but to test the critical theory. In so far as that depends on the usage of the appellations of God in Genesis we

submit that we have accomplished our task when we have proved that in some cases the Massoretic text is demonstrably wrong, and in an enormous proportion of other cases quite uncertain.[1]

4. In the passage quoted above, Mr. Carpenter claims that "the distinction which Astruc adopted has the direct sanction of the Pentateuch itself." What Pentateuch? The answer can only be the Samaritan Pentateuch, supported by the Massoretic recension of the Jewish Pentateuch. But not the sanction of the Jewish Pentateuch of Septuagint or Onkelos or Peshitto or Vulgate. In the crucial passage (Ex. vi. 3) these authorities all support a reading that has been preserved in a tenth-century Karaite MS.[2] It differs from the Massoretic reading only in a single letter. At first sight it appears to differ imperceptibly in sense, but we shall see that when the comparative method is brought to bear the difference turns out to be enormous. For נודעתי "I was known," it has, הודעתי "I made known," which is even more like the Massoretic text when both are written in the old Hebrew than in the square characters. In the result the LXX, at any rate, presents an absolutely consistent text, for in the two passages of Genesis (xv. 7

[1] The enormous number of variations suggests that Genesis must have been current in more than one form. Either owing to some palaeographical peculiarity, or some religious or other theory, or through some other cause, the Divine appellations varied. A number of ancient variants are due to the fact that י was often regarded as an abbreviation for the Tetragrammaton. We quote the following from Dr. Redpath: "There is no doubt, I think, that before the time when so much attention was directed to the accuracy, letter for letter, of the Hebrew canonical Scriptures, a considerable amount of abbreviation of words was used in their reproduction. There are frequent indications of this in the LXX; but I need not go into that now. What more concerns us, however, is the fact that the Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus show that two or three forms of abbreviation were used for the Tetragrammaton; and, if

[2] R. Hoerning, Karaite MSS. in the British Museum, p. 17.

and xxviii. 13) where God appears to a patriarch and uses the Tetragrammaton in a self-revelation the Greek has "God." The form of the Hebrew sentence is also favorable to this reading — so much so that Kittel wishes to alter "My Name" to "by My Name" which would go better with "I was not known." Surely a reading with so much authority involving so slight a departure from the received text of the Hebrew deserves some consideration before Genesis is split up under the sanction of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Massoretic text.

5. While our book of Genesis was assuredly based — at any rate in part — on preëxisting sources, the division into J, E and P does not meet the facts of the case. Nobody in his right senses ever supposed that the author of the Pentateuch sat down and invented all the statements made in the book of Genesis. He used preëxisting material, and it is even possible that the critics have really detected some glosses and (very occasionally) some points where different traditions join. But any services they may have rendered in these directions are more than outweighed by the crass absurdities they have put forward and by their failure to account for the evidence of pre-Mosaic date. We may take, as an example, Genesis x. 19, where

some similar form of abbreviation were used for the name Elohim, it is easy to see how constantly confusion might arise between the two names, in badly written or partly perished codices" (American Journal of Theology, vol. viii. p. 293). The duplicate psalms and the variations between Kings and Chronicles afford parallels for variations in the Divine appellations. It may reasonably be held that, in the entire absence of evidence, the reading of the Massoretic text should be preferred in most cases, other things being equal, the presumption being that the Jewish view, which ultimately prevailed, was on the whole sounder than any which did not ultimately prevail. It may also be added that the difficulty of forming an opinion is due to the supreme unimportance of the subject. The difference between the two appellations so seldom makes any appreciable difference to the text that all criteria fail.

the border of the Canaanite is fixed with the words, "as thou goest toward Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboiim."

The places named were destroyed in Abraham's lifetime. It follows that this passage must have been originally composed before the catastrophe narrated in Gen. xix. Mr. Carpenter attributes it, however, to a late stratum of "J" making it subsequent to xiii 10, which was obviously composed *after* the destruction of Sodom. Dr. Driver assigns the passage to J and writes:

"Nor does the language of 'J' and 'E' bring us to any more definite conclusion. Both belong to the golden period of Hebrew literature. They resemble the best parts of Judges and Samuel (much of which cannot be greatly later than David's own time); but whether they are actually earlier or later than these, the language and style do not enable us to say. . . . All things considered, both J and E may be assigned with the greatest probability to the early centuries of the monarchy" ("Literature of the Old Testament," sixth edition, pp. 124–125).

In other words, Dr. Driver would on "literary" grounds be prepared to accept a date 1,000 years after the age of Abraham as the time of composition of this passage. What precisely is the value of a method which does not permit its ablest and most cautious exponent to arrive at results that are correct to within 1,000 years? [The Churchman (London), February, 1908, p. 95.]

Precisely the same tale is told by the legal evidence in Genesis, which repeatedly attests the superior antiquity of the stories in Genesis to the laws of Exodus–Deuteronomy.[1] For example, the law of homicide contained in Genesis ix. (P) is demonstrably earlier than that of Exodus xxi. (E). The critical scheme does not and cannot account for such facts as these.

On the other hand, many of the divisions, even when not based on the appellations of the Deity, are as absurd as they can possibly be. Here is the scheme of the composition of Genesis xxxiv. 25 as believed by Dr. Driver:—

P: And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that
J: two of

[1] See the Churchman (London), January, 1908, pp. 15–23.

P: the sons of Jacob,
J: Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren,
P: took each man his sword, and came upon the city unawares, and slew all the males.

And where the critics cannot effect their purpose even by such divisions as these, they have recourse to the familiar machinery of redactors, harmonists, and glossators to conjure away inconvenient facts.

To sum up: the famous clue provided by Exodus vi. 3 leading to the division of the earlier portions of the Pentateuch into three self-consistent documents, J, E, and P, of which J uses the Tetragrammaton while E and P do not, breaks down for five different reasons: First, no such division can in fact be effected. Secondly, in so far as it is effected, it postulates a series of redactors whose alleged proceedings are unintelligible and inconceivable. Thirdly, in an enormous proportion of cases no reliance can be placed on the readings of the Massoretic text with regard to the Divine appellations. Fourthly, the reading adopted by the higher critics in Exodus vi. 3 is almost certainly wrong. Fifthly, the documentary theory founded on this "clue" does not account for the frequent traces of pre-Mosaic date, and postulates the most ludicrous divisions even where nothing turns on the appellations of the Deity.

It only remains to solve the difficulty presented by Exodus vi. 3 and the kindred passages.

As already explained, there is an alternative reading, differing from the Massoretic text only in a single letter, according to which God says, "I am the LORD: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but my Name the LORD I made not known unto them." This was regarded as the true reading by the best Jewish authorities of many countries and many ages, being embodied in numerous Versions, including the Targum of Onkelos.

If now we look through Genesis to find whether the Tetragrammaton is used by God himself (as distinct from his angel) in a revelation, we should probably only count xv. 7 and xxviii. 13. The other passages must be shortly considered.

(1) In xxii. 16 an *angel* appears to Abraham and uses the phrase "saith the LORD." But though Hebrew thought frequently made little or no distinction between God and his angel, yet at other times there is a clear difference, and it appears in this passage where the angel treats God's words as being those of a Being distinct from himself and accordingly makes them a quotation.

(2) In xviii. 19, the narrative represents God as using the Name in a *soliloquy*. This then is no contradiction of the statement of Exodus vi. 3.

(3) Lastly in xviii. 14 we have the speech "Is anything too hard for the LORD." Here all the Septuagintal authorities, except the Lucianic MSS., unite on "God" as the original reading of the LXX. This may be right, but we are not certain that even the Massoretic text is strictly in conflict with Exodus vi. 3. The true meaning of that passage (in so far as it can be ascertained with our present materials) can only be realized in the light of the comparative evidence, and it might be argued that it is to be interpreted of direct revelations of the Name, not of its use incidentally in conversation. This is a point on which no certain conclusion is at present possible, and we must therefore leave it as doubtful, bearing in mind the fact that there is an important variant in the LXX.

This exhausts the other passages, and it only remains to consider xxviii. 13 and xv. 7. The former case is absolutely clear on mere grounds of textual criticism. (*a*) A Hebrew MS. omits the word "LORD" and there can be very little doubt that originally the LXX did too. (*b*) The analogy of xxvi. 24

favors the reading "I am the God of Abraham thy father." (*c*) Palæographically the presumption is in favor of the shorter text. It is known that י was frequently treated as an abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton. A good instance occurs in Exodus xxxiii. 19, where the LXX treated בשמי, as one word, and translated "On my name," while the Massoretic tradition divided it into two and read בשם י "On the name of the LORD." But אני "I" ends in י. Hence the reading has arisen from this י, probably from its having been accidentally written twice over, possibly however in another way. There are two ways of writing this word — in full with the י, or *defectivè* without the י. Thus in days before separate forms were adopted for some of the final letters, and when the words were not divided, it would be possible, if the word were written with the י, for a reader to think it was written *defectivè* and read אני as אֲנִי. Quite apart therefore from the testimony of Exodus vi. 3, it is clear that the Tetragrammaton is not original in this passage.

There only remains xv. 7. Here the Massoretic text reads "LORD" and the LXX "God." There is no palæographical probability one way or another. We have seen that the Tetragrammaton has certainly ousted *Elohim* from the Massoretic text in some other passages, and it is therefore possible that it has done so here. We think the Septuagintal reading right, because (1) the testimony of Exodus vi. 3 is here certain and explicit; and (2) in all the other passages in Genesis where God appears the Tetragrammaton is avoided in the revelation.

Thus it would seem that originally the Pentateuch presented a consistent text in which God announced to Moses that He had revealed Himself to the patriarchs, but had not revealed Himself by His Name.

While this text is formally consistent, it at first sight appears

to mean nothing intelligible. It is at this stage that the comparative historical method comes to the rescue, and enables us to appreciate the true sense — at any rate to some extent.

In order to understand the Pentateuch we must so far as possible restore the conditions for which it was in the first instance designed. Those who believe in a God will not doubt that it is possible for Him to give men new hearts in the spiritual sense; but no attentive reader of the Pentateuch will suppose that He is represented as having done so to the Hebrews who left Egypt. Still less can it be conceived that He gave them new hearts in the intellectual sense. Enactment after enactment, narrative after narrative, are only intelligible when it is realized that the intellectual condition of the Israelites in the Mosaic Age was very rudimentary.[1] Customs, laws, actions, alike receive a new aspect when considered in the light of what is known of other races in a more or less primitive condition. Accordingly when we find a passage in which obvious importance is attached to the revelation of a name, we proceed to ask: (1) whether there are any known primitive ideas which would assist us in comprehending this; and (2) whether there are any traces of such ideas in the Bible.

The very familiarity of many of the biblical passages frequently prevents our realizing how far removed are the ideas they represent from those of our own day. Yet they contain the most convincing evidence that names were often regarded as something very much more than the mere labels they are to-day. Take the numerous passages in which we read of God's "setting his Name" at Jerusalem, or making his Name dwell there, or of a House being built to his Name. They presuppose the *objective existence* of the Name. In Deuteronomy

[1] See Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary (1908), p. 462b.

xxviii. 58 we read of "this glorious and awful Name" as a proper subject of fear. This Name may be profaned not merely by false swearing (Lev. xix. 12) — an idea that is comparatively intelligible even in the light of modern notions — but by actions such as giving seed to Molech (Lev. xviii. 21; xx. 3), or by priests violating the rules laid down for their caste (Lev. xxi. 6; cp. Mal. i. 6 ff.). In this Name men may trust (Isa. l. 10): in it men may find help (Ps. cxxiv. 8; cp. xx. 1 f.). But perhaps the two passages in which the conception of the objective existence of the Name is carried farthest are Exodus xxiii. 20 f. and Isaiah xxx. 27. The former passage runs thus: "Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee to the place which I have prepared. Take heed of him, and hearken unto his voice: provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgression, *for My Name is in him.*" It would be impossible to hold a clearer view of the definite objective existence of a name and of its being indued with special powers, than is here revealed. Isaiah xxx. 27 is a little different: "Behold, the Name of the LORD cometh from far, burning with his anger, and in thick rising smoke: his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue is as a devouring fire." Here the Name of the LORD might almost be taken as a term for God himself. But whatever interpretation be put on this passage, one thing is clear: the use of language here can have arisen only out of notions in which a name was regarded as having a separate objective existence.

These notions are widely spread among primitive peoples. Here is the testimony of various writers.

"Unable to discriminate clearly between words and things [writes Dr. Frazer], the savage commonly fancies that the link between a name and the person or thing denominated by it is not a mere arbitrary and ideal association, but a real and substantial bond which unites the two in such a way that, for example, magic may be

wrought on a man just as easily through his name as through his hair, his nails or any other material part of his person. In fact, primitive man regards his name as a vital portion of himself and takes care of it accordingly." (Frazer, Golden Bough (2d ed.) vol. i. pp. 403 f.)

"It may be said [says Dr. Tylor] . . . . that the effect of an inability to separate, so clearly as we do, the external object from the mere thought or idea of it in the mind, shows itself very fully and clearly in the superstitious beliefs and practices of the untaught man, but its results are by no means confined to such matters. . . . But between our clearness of separation of what is in the mind from what is out of it, and the mental confusion of the lowest savages of our own day, there is a vast interval. . . . Especially we may see, in the superstitions connected with language, the vast difference between what a name is to the savage and what it is to us, to whom 'words are the counters of wise men and the money of fools.'" (E. B. Tylor, Early History of Mankind (3d ed.) pp. 148 f.)

"Barbaric man believes that his name is a vital part of himself, and therefore that the names of other men and of superhuman beings are also vital parts of themselves. He further believes that to know the name is to put its owner, whether he be deity, ghost, or mortal, in the power of another, involving risk of harm or destruction to the named. He therefore takes all kinds of precautions to conceal his name, often from his friend, and always from his foe. This belief, and the resulting acts, as will be shown presently, are a part of that general confusion between the objective and the subjective—in other words, between names and things or between symbols and realities—which is a universal feature of barbaric modes of thought. This confusion attributes the qualities of living things to things not living. . . . To look for any consistency in barbaric philosophy is to disqualify ourselves for understanding it, and the theories of it which aim at symmetry are their own condemnation." (E. Clodd, Tom-Tit-Tot, pp. 53–55.)[1]

This theory of the objective existence of the name is evidenced by all sorts of superstitions. The idea underlying some of them gives us the necessary clue to the explanation of our passage. Thus Dr. Tylor writes that "the intense aversion which savages have from uttering their own names, has often been noticed by travellers." (*Op. cit.*, p. 140.) Numerous customs could be cited from the works of Tylor and Frazer,

[1] We are indebted to Frazer's Golden Bough for this reference.

but they would consume too much space. We therefore limit ourselves for the present to the following extracts from Frazer's "Golden Bough."

"When an Ojebway is asked his name, he will look at some bystander and ask him to answer. 'This reluctance arises from an impression they receive when young, that if they repeat their own names it will prevent their growth, and they will be small in stature.' . . . In this last case no scruple seems to be felt about communicating a man's name to strangers, and no ill effects appear to be dreaded as a consequence of divulging it; harm is only done when a name is spoken by its owner. Why is this? and why in particular should a man be thought to stunt his growth by uttering his own name? We may conjecture that to savages who act and think thus a person's name only seems to be a part of himself when it is uttered with his own breath; uttered by the breath of others it has no vital connection with him, and no harm can come to him through it. Whereas, so these primitive philosophers may have argued, when a man lets his own name pass his lips, he is parting with a living piece of himself, and if he persists in so reckless a course he must certainly end by dissipating his energy and shattering his constitution. . . .

"However we may explain it, the fact is certain that many a savage evinces the strongest reluctance to pronounce his own name, while at the same time he makes no objection at all to other people pronouncing it, and will even invite them to do so for him in order to satisfy the curiosity of an inquisitive stranger. Thus in some parts of Madagascar it is *fady* or taboo for a person to tell his own name, but a slave or attendant will answer for him. . . . The same curious inconsistency, as it may seem to us, is recorded of some tribes of American Indians. Thus we are told that 'the name of an American Indian is a sacred thing, not to be divulged by the owner himself without due consideration. One may ask a warrior of any tribe to give his name, and the question will meet with either a point-blank refusal or the more diplomatic evasion that he cannot understand what is wanted of him. The moment a friend approaches, the warrior first interrogated will whisper what is wanted, and the friend can tell the name, receiving a reciprocation of the courtesy from the other.'

"This general statement applies, for example, to the Indian tribes of British Columbia, as to whom it is said that 'one of their strangest prejudices, which appears to pervade all tribes alike, is a dislike to telling their names—thus you never get a man's right name from himself; but they will tell each other's names without

hesitation.' . . . In the whole of the East Indian Archipelago the etiquette is the same. As a general rule no one will utter his own name. To inquire, 'What is your name?' is a very indelicate question in native society."

Mr. Frazer then quotes a number of other examples, concluding, " No Warua will tell his name, but he does not object to being addressed by it." He then proceeds to deal with other customs which bear on our subject and should be considered by all who are interested in it (see Golden Bough, 2d ed., vol. i. pp. 403 ff.). In particular Exodus vi. 3 should be compared with what Dr. Frazer says about secondary names.

On the other hand, Dr. Giesebrecht, who has written a monograph on the importance of the Divine Name in the Old Testament, in summing up the results of his examination of a quantity of comparative material, comes to a somewhat different conclusion with regard to the use of the name of a deity. He holds that the name of the god puts his power at the disposal of the person using it. By its very nature the power of a god is greater than the power of a man. Therefore the name of a god is the strongest conceivable source of power that a man can hold.[1]

With the precise explanations that have been offered of the varying phenomena we are not greatly concerned. Possibly no single explanation will account for all the facts. For our present purpose we have to note two points. First, a name is conceived as having an objective existence and as being either closely linked with or else an actual part of its bearer: (and it is immaterial whether this is best expressed by comparing the relation of the two to that of a man and his shadow or in some other way). Secondly, there is a wide difference in the view of many savages between a man's pronouncing his name him-

[1] Giesebrecht Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage, Königsberg, 1901, p. 90.

self in answer to the direct question and merely being accosted by it. If in reply to a question he gives his name, it is held that he is giving his interlocutor some hold on him.

We proceed to apply these notions to the problem before us. We have seen that among the ancient Hebrews some similar ideas prevailed, and the great work of the Mosaic Age was necessarily conditioned by the intellectual condition of the people for and through whom it was wrought. It is of course evident that the Pentateuch regards the Name of God as wonderworking. We have quoted the passages from Deuteronomy where it is spoken of as "glorious and awful" and the command to fear it is given, and from Exodus where an angel will punish sin because this Name is in him. Now let us go back to another passage that has an important bearing on our point. Jacob wrestles with a stranger, and asks his name. The answer refuses the information sought. "Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name?" (Gen. xxxii. 30 (29).) Still more significant is a passage in the book of Judges: "And Manoah said unto the angel of the LORD, What is thy name, that when thy words come to pass we may do thee honor? And the angel of the LORD said unto him, Wherefore askest thou after my name, seeing it is wonderful"[1] (xiii. 17 f.). But most interesting and significant of all is the refusal of the Name to Moses himself. He endeavors to induce God to say "I am the LORD." The result is a most interesting avoidance. Instead of the clear answer, the reply "I am that I am" is given (Ex. iii. 14). This appears to be an example of the common Semitic *idem per idem* construction by which a speaker refuses information. Then as the Name could not be withheld quâ information, while it was desired to withhold it quâ pledge of God's presence, recourse is had to a quotation. God does not say, "I am

[1] Or "secret."

the LORD." On the contrary, he instructs Moses to say to the children of Israel, "The LORD, the God of your fathers," etc., and this method is persistently adhered to (iii. 15, 16, 18). How unnatural it is will be seen when we contrast (1) the subsequent frequency of the "I am the LORD" that rings through the Pentateuch after vi. 2, and (2) the very direct "I am the God of thy father" used in iii. 6 and in other places. We shall revert to this passage in a moment, for we have not yet exhausted the information it conveys. But we shall understand it better when we have examined Exodus vi. 2 more carefully. Meanwhile there is a savage parallel that comes very close to this: "Among many tribes of South Africa men and women never mention their names if they can get any one else to do it for them, but they do not absolutely refuse when it cannot be avoided." [1]

To the Israelite of the Mosaic Age it is clear that what may be called the direct and intentional revelation of the Divine Name by God (i.e. the unambiguous statement "I am the LORD") to a mortal had a very special significance. It may be that it was regarded as a direct pledge of the Divine presence: or again as an objective handing over of power to work certain wonders: or as establishing a special relationship between the Deity and the favored mortal: or as involving all these. The precise shade of meaning must be left to be determined by future research. That there was such a meaning appears to us indubitable in the light of the passages and parallels we have considered.

It remains to examine the narrative and see how Exodus vi. 2 fits into the context on this conception of its meaning. Is there anything to lead an impartial reader to hold either that this passage gives a pledge of closer connection or of the use of

[1] Frazer, *op. cit.* vol. i. p. 411.

Divine might or that such a pledge would be in place? The answer to both branches of the question can be only in the affirmative. The intervention of Moses has served only to make the position of the Israelites worse, and they are not slow to give vent to their dissatisfaction (v. 21). Then Moses returns to the LORD with the words: "Lord, wherefore hast thou evil entreated this people? Why is it that thou hast sent me? For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he hath evil entreated this people; *neither hast thou delivered thy people at all.*" The last words in particular show that Moses was in a mood when some guarantee of the Divine assistance was needed. Then comes the promise "Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh: for by a strong hand shall he let them go, and by a strong hand shall he drive them out of his land." Then comes the revelation of the Name, clinching this promise. The context thus leads up to the passage admirably on this view of its true meaning: if now we examine vi. 2–8 in the light of these ideas it will be found that the other portions of the Divine utterance bear this out. Stress is laid on the fact that something — some connection with God — is being given to the Hebrews that had not been given to the patriarchs. And this relationship either includes, or at any rate is linked with, the sure promise of salvation: "I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians," etc. That is the answer to the complaint of Moses, and it is a complete answer.

We thus conceive the utterance of the words "I am the LORD" not as the introduction of a new and unfamiliar name, nor as the revelation of a new meaning possessed by a name already known, but as the inauguration of a new and more intimate relationship. By them the use of the Divine might on Israel's behalf was irrevocably pledged in a manner in which it

had not been before: and this was done in the way that would be most intelligible and convincing to people in the intellectual condition of the Israelites of that day.

We return now to the narrative of Exodus iii. In verse 6 God reveals himself to Moses with the words "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham," etc. Two points call for attention. First, the Tetragrammaton is not used; and, secondly, the revelation is made to stand on precisely the same level as the revelations to the patriarchs. Here God raises Moses to the same position as Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, but to no more intimate relationship. He then proceeds to give Moses his mission. This draws from the mortal an expression of his own incapacity, to which God replies that He will be with him (ver. 12). Then comes the question as to the Name. It has a double meaning. Superficially and ostensibly it is a request for information: but in its full and most fundamental signification it is a demand for a guarantee — to put the matter at its lowest. Accordingly it receives a twofold answer. The request for the guarantee is unambiguously refused: the desired information is readily given. And throughout that answer the identification with the God of the fathers is carefully maintained. Moses is still kept on the same plane as the patriarchs. This leaves him as dissatisfied as before, and it becomes necessary to give him the power to work certain signs. Thus the narrative contrasts with the later revelation in two important respects: (1) Whereas in Exodus iii. Moses receives the same sort of revelation as the patriarchs, in Exodus vi. God enters into a connection with the Hebrews that differs fundamentally from His relation to their ancestors. (2) In the earlier incident it is necessary to confer on Moses power to work certain signs, in the later the phrase "I am the LORD" is in itself sufficient, without anything more. Both these points are comprehended

in the third great distinction — the use of the phrase "I am the LORD" in chapter vi. as against its studied avoidance in chapter iii.

To modern ideas it seems strange that God should say, "Is it not I, the LORD" in iv. 11, or that there should ever have been a time when such a phrase or the statement "Thus shalt thou say. . . .The LORD, the God of your fathers," etc., should not be held to embrace everything that is comprehended in the formula of vi. 2 f., but we must take early societies as we find them. The sentence already quoted from Mr. Clodd sums up the opinion of all the ablest and most experienced investigators of this branch of anthropology: "To look for any consistency in barbaric philosophy is to disqualify ourselves for understanding it, and the theories of it which aim at symmetry are their own condemnation." Thus it comes about that to the Israelites of the Mosaic Age there would be no inconsistency or difficulty in the statements of the Pentateuch. They would realize that the true inward meaning was to make the LORD their God, to bind Him to them and them to Him in a closeness of connection which He had never before vouchsafed to any of His creatures.

CHAPTER II.

In coming to the other difficulties raised on the early chapters of Exodus, we begin with Mr. Carpenter's opening note on the book, but for reasons of convenience we defer the consideration of the numbers of the Israelites.[1]

EGYPT OR GOSHEN?

"According to J [writes Mr. Carpenter on Exodus] Gen xlv 10 xlvi 28 xlvii 27a Israel is settled in Goshen, and this view is found in viii 22 ix 26. . . . But in E Gen xlvi 18 [xlv 18?] and P Gen xlvii 11 the Israelites settle in Egypt. There they are accordingly found in close proximity with Egyptian neighbours, from whom they can ask for valuables iii 22 xi 2, or from whose houses they must carefully distinguish their own that the Lord may pass over them xii 13. They are near enough to the capital for the king to communicate with the Hebrew midwives." (Oxford Hexateuch, vol. ii. p. 80.)

It has already been pointed out in the Bibliotheca Sacra for January, 1907 (p. 12), that J, which places the Israelites in Goshen, regards them as being in sufficiently "close proximity with Egyptian neighbours" to be in danger of stoning (Ex. viii. 26). "Clearly if the Israelites in Goshen were near enough to the Egyptians to be aptly described as being 'before their eyes' and in danger of stoning, they were near enough

[1] See *infra*, pp. 155–169.

to borrow jewels when occasion arose. The critics seem wholly unable to realize that the residence of the Israelites in Goshen does not necessarily exclude the presence of Egyptians in that district." It is, however, right also to examine the passages in J, on which Mr. Carpenter relies, in order to see how this supposed contradiction has been created. In Genesis xlv. 10 he prints without comment "and thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, *and thou shalt be near unto me,*" etc.; and in xlvii. 27a ("and Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen") he is compelled to treat "in the land of Egypt" as a "harmonizing addition" by a priestly redactor, for no reason save that this is the only method by which a contradiction can be manufactured.

Having thus taken a narrative which regards the Israelites as being settled in the land of Egypt in the land of Goshen, and manufactured a contradiction by garbling Genesis xlvii. 27 and disregarding Genesis xlv. 10 and Exodus viii. 26, Mr. Carpenter is naturally in the position of being able to use this factitious contradiction for the purposes of the analysis. Accordingly, when he comes to Exodus iii. 21–22, he tears these verses from their context and assigns them to E, because "these instructions must obviously belong to the narrator who regards the Israelites as settled, not apart in the land of Goshen, but among the Egyptians themselves." [1]

[1] It is worth noting Mr. Carpenter's method of dealing with iii. 19 f. Having got rid of 21 f. on the ground stated above, he writes: "These verses do not seem in their present form to belong either to J or to E. Not to J because (1) they interrupt the connexion between iii 16–18 and iv 1, and (2) they contain distinct literary marks of E, 'give you leave' and the peculiar infinitive 'to go' [Heb.]. Yet on the other hand the phrase 'by a mighty hand' does not belong to E, but tends to appear in passages kindred with D: for 'wonders' cp xxxiv 10. The passage seems to have been amplified from E by Rje" [*ad. loc.*, p. 84]. That these verses should appear out of place when their proper sequel is removed is of course

Again, in his note on vii. 8, in dealing with the narrative of the plagues, he writes: "J has already located the Israelites in the land of Goshen Gen xlv 10 and they are accordingly represented as residing there in viii 22 ix 26; they are consequently unaffected by the flies or the hail. On the other hand, in x 21–23 they are living in the midst of the people in Egypt itself, and their immunity from the oppression of the darkness is secured by the appearance of light in their dwellings. This latter view of their intermingling with the Egyptians lies at the basis of the instructions in iii 21 f and their sequel xi 2 f, and the passages founded on it must be assigned to E." The statement in x. 21–23 is that "there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt . . . . but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." There is here no suggestion that these dwellings were anywhere but "in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen." Once more this misconception makes its appearance. In the note on xii. 21 we read, "In 21–27 there are traces of different hands blended into one editorial complex. The opening and closing formulæ seem to belong to J . . . . though it may be questioned how far the implication that the Israelites were mixed up with the Egyptians can be ascribed to the original J, who places them apart in Goshen." If Mr. Carpenter could only have realized that "in Goshen" does not necessarily mean "apart in Goshen" either

inevitable. It results not from any impropriety in the narrative, but from Mr. Carpenter's own proceedings. As to his "literary marks," it is interesting to turn up the references in his lists of words. Of "give you leave" it is alleged that it occurs five times in E, once in J in a passage assigned to a priestly redactor, once here, where it is given to RJe, and twice in D. As to "by a mighty hand," the list of words contains five references to JE, five to D, and one to a Deuteronomic redactor in Joshua iv. 24. It will occur to most people to wonder that this sort of argument can be gravely put forward and considered by men who claim to be scholars.

in Hebrew or in English, he might have been spared much embarrassment.

THE STORY OF MOSES.

The next charge is as follows:—

"The story of Moses further shows some interesting variations. In ii 15 f he dwells in the land of Midian, and in 16, 21 marries the daughter of the priest of Midian and has one son 21 f cp iv 19 f. When he returns to Egypt his wife and son accompany him iv 20. In iii 1, however, his father in law is named Jethro cp iv 18, and Moses leads the flock to the mountain of God, identified as Horeb cp 'this mountain' 12. On his return to Egypt his wife remains behind, and when Jethro brings her to her husband she has two sons xviii 5 f; later on she is described as a Cushite Num xii 1." (Vol. ii. p. 80.)

There are here four distinct charges: (1) in one document (J) the father-in-law of Moses is the priest of Midian, in another (E) he is Jethro; (2) in J Moses has one son, in E two: (3) in J he is accompanied to Egypt by his wife and son, in E they remain with Jethro; (4) in Numbers Moses has a wife who is a Cushite.

We begin with the first charge. The father-in-law is named "Jethro, the priest of Midian," in the following passages of E: Ex. iii. 1 and xviii. 1. He is named "Jethro" in the following passages of J: Ex. xviii. 9, 10; also in xviii. 2 (RJe), to be considered presently. He is called "the priest of Midian" *once and once only* in J, viz. ii. 16.

On this, Mr. Carpenter proceeds as follows: When E speaks of "Jethro, the priest of Midian," he simply assigns the words "priest of Midian" to the laborious gentleman who combined J with E. His only reason for doing so is expressed in the note on iii. 1b. "Some critics think that according to E the father-in-law of Moses was not himself priest. If so, these words must be regarded as a harmonistic addition." Similarly with "Jethro" in J. It is of course nowhere sug-

gested that there is a scintilla of evidence to justify these proceedings. Such testimony as exists of ancient variants is wholly opposed to Mr. Carpenter's theory, for in iii. 1 (E) the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint omits not "the priest of Midian" but "Jethro." But it suits Mr. Carpenter to attribute certain words to convenient redactors; and accordingly he does so, and thereby manufactures discrepancies. So out of the three places in all where "priest of Midian" occurs in the Pentateuch, two go to the harmonist. As to the alleged mental processes of "some critics" adduced as a justification for these proceedings, it will become increasingly clear as this inquiry proceeds what weight should be attributed to them.

Our second "interesting variation" concerns the sons of Moses. It is perfectly true that the narrative in Exodus ii. only relates the birth of the first son, but it by no means follows from this that Moses never had another. In point of fact J proceeds to state (iv. 20) that "Moses took his wife and his *sons*," and Mr. Carpenter only gets out of this by altering the plural into the singular, of course charging one of the indispensable redactors with having changed the text. His reasons are as follows: "J has only related the birth of one son ii 22, and 25 implies that there was no second. The plural seems to be an editorial reference to xviii 2–4." But if we turn to the note on xviii. 2 we find that the analysis there is justified by the assertion that "in J Moses had but one son, on his return to Egypt, when his wife accompanied him iv 20, 25." The only real foundation for all this is the expression "her son" in iv. 25. From this Mr. Carpenter infers that Zipporah had only one son. But he forgets that, on his own showing, iv. 24–26 is incomplete. He himself believes that it comes from a source more ancient that J. In that case it cannot be taken to prove that J itself knew only of one son.

For ourselves we think that there is some ground for holding the narrative contained in these verses incomplete in its present form. Something has perhaps dropped out of the text, and consequently no inference should be drawn from it. If that view be adopted, or if Mr. Carpenter's inference from the expression "her son" occurring in a narrative which he himself regards as fragmentary be rejected, the whole case falls to the ground.

Before proceeding with the other variations charged, it is desirable to deal with the only substantial point that is alleged on the analysis of chapter xviii. Mr. Carpenter states it thus: "In 5 f Jethro arrives and converses with Moses, yet in 7 Moses sets out to meet him" (note on xviii. 2). It is curious how the critics who are always quick to note any variation in the Samaritan or the Versions that can in their opinion be twisted into the service of their hypothesis ignore those valuable aids when they tend to show that the analysis is based on textual corruption. In this instance the Samaritan, Septuagint, Syriac, all read הנה "behold," in verse 6, for the Massoretic אני "I." The editors of Exodus in Kittel's "Biblia Hebraica" aptly compare Genesis xlviii. 2, where the R. V. (Mr. Carpenter agreeing) renders the Hebrew "and one told Jacob and said, Behold, thy son Joseph cometh unto thee." On that analogy Exodus xviii. 6 would mean "and one [or, according to another possible pointing of the Hebrew, "they"] said unto Moses, Behold, thy father-in-law Jethro cometh," etc. We think this text manifestly superior to the present reading of the Hebrew, and it will be observed how much the narrative gains in continuity if this change be adopted. Another illustration of precisely the same error is afforded by Genesis xii. 11, where the Septuagint appears to have had a Hebrew text reading "I," for

the correct Massoretic "behold." It should be added that in xviii. 6, the Septuagint appears to be based on a Hebrew text, which, like Genesis xlviii. 2, read, "And one told Moses and said."

We turn now to the statement that in E on the return of Moses his wife remains behind. This is pure fiction. There is not a word in the passages attributed to E that in any wise supports the assertion. Nevertheless, Mr. Carpenter, having once got it into his head, does not fail to repeat it in his note on xviii. 2, saying, "E, on the other hand, represented Moses as leaving his family under his father in law's care." This is as untrue as the allegation that J placed the Israelites *apart* in Goshen. With the correction of the text in xviii. 6 the whole of that chapter forms an intelligible and continuous narrative, and the statements in 2 ff. that Moses had sent his wife and sons away and that they were subsequently brought to him entirely fit in with all that has gone before. It is not impossible that the original text of iv. 26 told how Zipporah (not the angel) left Moses after calling him a bridegroom of blood.

As to the Cushite wife, nobody knows whether this refers to a second wife or whether she is identical with Zipporah,[1] recent discoveries having given ground for supposing that there was a Cush in North Arabia; and Mr. Carpenter does not make any serious attempt to rely on this point for the purposes of his analysis.

To sum up: all the alleged variations on which Mr. Carpenter places any reliance are factitious with the possible exception of the inference he draws from the phrase "her son" in iv. 25 in a passage which he himself regards as an incomplete fragment; but we have found that in a kindred chapter there is

[1] As will subsequently appear in our discussion of the position of the Tent of Meeting (*infra*, p. 99, note), we think this hypothesis very plausible.

good reason for supposing that a slight corruption of the text is responsible for a seeming inconsistency in the narrative.

MOSES AND AARON OR MOSES?

Mr. Carpenter's next charge is extremely obscure:—

"In the interviews with Pharaoh one set of demands is urged by Moses alone in the name of 'the LORD God of the Hebrews' iii 18 v 3 vii 16 ix 1 f, 13 x 3; and Moses asks leave to go three days' journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the LORD iii 18 v 3 viii 27, or serve him vii 16 viii 1, 20 ix 1, 13 x 3, etc. Another formula is found in iii 12, 'serve Elohim upon this mountain,' while in the name of 'the LORD God of Israel' Moses requires the release of Israel that they may hold a feast to him in the wilderness v 1. A third demand is made by Aaron vii 2–7." (Vol. ii. p. 80.)

While Mr. Carpenter's grievances are not at all clear, the same cannot be said of his misrepresentations. First, it is not true that "Moses alone" urges one set of demands in v. 3, etc. (J) or that "Moses" (as contrasted apparently with Moses and Aaron) requires the release in v. 1 (E). In v. 1 (E) Mr. Carpenter prints "Moses and Aaron came." In v. 3 (J) he prints "And *they* said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with *us*" (whom?). In v. 4 (E) he again prints "Wherefore do *ye, Moses and Aaron,* loose the people," etc. In v 20 (J) he suddenly remembers himself and assigns "*and Aaron*" to the convenient redactor, but he forgets to alter "unto *them*" in the very next verse. In viii. 8, 12, 25; ix. 27 (all J) the redactor is called in, but Mr. Carpenter overlooks the plural in ix. 27 and 28. In x. 3 (J) "And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and said" goes to a harmonist, and in 8 (J) the redactor is dragged in to account for "and Aaron," as also in 16 (J); but Mr. Carpenter cannot be expected to remember that in 8 (J) "unto them" is also plural, and that in 11 (J) "*they*" were driven from Pharaoh's presence. Once more in xii. 31 (J) "and Aaron" is swept away by the usual method, but "both ye and the chil-

dren of Israel" is suffered to remain. Lastly in Joshua xxiv. 5 E is made to say, "And I sent Moses and Aaron."[1] The statement that "a third demand is made by Aaron" (vii. 2–7) is also untrue, inasmuch as the passage cited shows Moses and Aaron coöperating, Aaron being his brother's mouthpiece. Further it is not true that a *third* demand is made by Aaron. No fresh information is given as to this demand. It is only the same demand as before. Nor are there two other demands, for there is no difference between asking to go into the wilderness to hold a feast and asking to go into the wilderness and sacrifice. There are abundant instances of sacrificial feasts. As to "the LORD the God of Israel," this is one of Mr. Carpenter's factitious "literary marks." It is used *once,* and once only, in v. 1, and draws from Pharaoh the speech "Who is the LORD, . . . I know not the LORD." Whereupon the explanation is given, "The God of the Hebrews hath met with us," etc. Mr. Carpenter is impressed with the phrase "serve *Elohim*" in iii. 12: does he really imagine that "*Elohim* of the Hebrews" could be used by God in speaking to Moses or any Hebrew?

At this point it will probably be convenient to deal with the note on iv. 13, which connects with Mr. Carpenter's allegations about Moses and Aaron. It begins as follows:—

"In 13–16 it is not apparent in what way the anger of the LORD expresses itself against the reluctance of Moses. It is believed, therefore, that this is really a later insertion to prepare for the introduction of Aaron, for whom a place had to be found in the story. The want of uniformity in his appearances, the curious alternation between plural and singular verbs in the immediate context of his entry into the narrative (cp viii 8, 12a, 25, 28 ix 27 x 16, 17b with viii 9, 12b, 29 ix 33 x 7a, 18), and the fact that in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary he had no function, Joshua being the servitor of Moses in the Tent of Meeting Ex xxxiii 11, render it probable that the passages narrating his activity are all secondary as compared with the original J." (Vol. ii. p. 85.)

[1] Cp. also Aaron's presence in Exodus xix. 24 (E), etc.

The anger of the LORD will be seen to express itself quite clearly in the rebuke to Moses. The "want of uniformity" in Aaron's appearances is made perfectly clear by the narrative itself. Throughout Moses was in the position of God to Aaron, who played a very subsidiary rôle, and in these circumstances an ancient Hebrew could see no inconsistency in using singular and plural almost indifferently. A very curious illustration is to be found in vii. 8 f., attributed to P, who is supposed to exalt Aaron. God says to the brothers, "When Pharaoh shall speak unto *you*, saying, Show a wonder for *you;* then *thou* shalt say unto Aaron." It would be difficult to convey a more vivid conception of the relationship between the two or its effect on the mode of expression than is here afforded. A parallel instance is provided by the plural in Deuteronomy xxxi. 19, in "Write *ye* this song for *you*, and teach *thou* it the children of Israel," spoken (16) to Moses, and again puzzles Mr. Carpenter, who appears to be out of sympathy with Hebrew methods of thought and expression in this matter. Nevertheless he raises no objection to the similar alternations of singular and plural in Gen. xix. 17–19.

The alleged "fact that in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary" Aaron "had no function" needs further investigation, for it supplies one of the most convincing examples of the wholly unscientific procedure of the critics.

THE MINISTRY OF THE SANCTUARY.

Perhaps the clearest account of Mr. Carpenter's views as to this is to be found in his note on xxxiii. 7 (p. 133). "Further, it [i.e. the Tent of Meeting] is not served by the Levitical priesthood, but by the Ephraimite Joshua 11 Num xi 28, whose presence in the Dwelling would have been forbidden under pain of death." Reading this with the statement al-

ready quoted that in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary Aaron had no function, it would seem that Mr. Carpenter holds either that the Aaronic and the Levitical priesthood was not recognized in E, or else that it was in some way different from that of P. We say advisedly "it would seem," because there is considerable difficulty in ascertaining Mr. Carpenter's meaning, owing to the inveterate higher critical habit of self-contradiction. On page 114 of Volume I., we read, "The Tent of Meeting, however, when first instituted, needed the service of no sacred tribe. It was not even placed under the care of Aaron and his sons. An Ephraimite, Moses' minister, the young Joshua, was installed as its guardian; and when Moses returned into the camp, Joshua remained within the Tent. Neverthless E does apparently contain traces of an Aaronic priesthood in the statement that on Aaron's death at Moserah, Eleazar his son succeeded him in the priestly office Deut x 6."

What Mr. Carpenter means by saying in one place that "in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary Aaron had no function," and in another that the same document contains traces of an Aaronic priesthood, we cannot understand. But his idea that Joshua's presence in the Dwelling when first instituted would have been forbidden under the laws of P is flatly contradicted by the language of that document. In Numbers xviii. 22 we read, "And the children of Israel shall not come nigh *any more* to the Tent of Meeting." No doubt this refers primarily to xvii. 13 (Heb. 28), but it would seem from these passages that the law was thought to be less stringent before Korah's rebellion. Even assuming, therefore, that the Tent in which Joshua remained was in fact a "sanctuary,"—which we take leave to doubt,—and identical with the Dwelling which had not yet been construct-

ed, it does not appear that E necessarily conflicts with P in this respect—even for those who would not admit that Joshua as the minister of Moses probably enjoyed some exceptional privileges.

In order, however, to make it clear that no priesthood save that of Aaron and the tribe of Levi is recognized by E, we propose to go somewhat more fully into the matter. We shall examine, first, the historical position postulated for E; secondly, the evidence of E as to the priesthood; thirdly, its evidence as to Joshua.

Mr. Carpenter, with considerable hesitation, ascribes the reduction of E to writing to the first half of the eighth century B.C. (vol. i. p. 119). Now there are abundant traces of the sacerdotal character of the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron in the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Micah's Levite (Judges xvii.), the house of Eli, Zadok and Abiathar —to mention no other instances—all bear witness to the unsoundness of any theory that might seek to throw doubts on the ministry of the sacred tribe and the family of Aaron.

But the evidence of E itself is still more interesting. According to Mr. Carpenter, Deuteronomy x. 6, with its uncompromising statement that "Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his [Aaron's] stead," must be assigned to this document. The blessing of Moses was also "incorporated" in E, and there we read, "And of Levi he said, Thy Thummim and thy Urim are with thy godly one. . . . They shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt-offering upon thine altar" (Deut. xxxiii. 8, 10). Of these passages Mr. Carpenter does indeed seem to have been dimly conscious, but there are others that he has entirely forgotten. The book of Joshua, it will be remembered, is ascribed to the same sources as the Pentateuch, and accordingly E figures there also. The information that

may be gathered from a perusal of its fragments is singularly unfavorable. In iii. 3 we read, "When ye see the ark .... and the priests the Levites bearing it." True, Mr. Carpenter remembers to assign "the Levites" to a redactor, but even that does not dispose of the awkward fact that the narrative of E here recognizes priests other than the Ephraimite Joshua (who is sharply distinguished from them), and that these priests have the custody of the ark. In verse 6 we read, "and Joshua spake unto the priests, saying, Take up the ark .... and they took up the ark." In 14 we hear again of "the priests that bare the ark." Again and again this representation of the priests recurs (see Joshua vi. 4–9, 12b, 13, 20b). Finally it is E that in the last verse of the book narrates the death of Eleazar the son of Aaron.

It is in the light of these facts that we turn to see what the representations of E as to the alleged "ministry" of the Ephraimite Joshua really are. It does not appear that he was ever in charge of the ark or performed any sacrificial function whatever, nor did he "serve" the Tent. The whole case amounts to this. In Exodus xxxiii. 7, *before* the ark was in existence, Moses takes a tent and pitches it without the camp *for himself* (so the Hebrew; see Van Hoonacker, Sacerdoce lévitique, p. 146, note). This appears to have been a practice—not an isolated act—and from verse 11 we learn that Joshua remained there when Moses returned, as minister of Moses, *not* as performing any priestly function. On another occasion Moses and a number of elders were near "the Tent" when Joshua made an observation (Num. xi. 28). We shall consider what this Tent was when we come to discuss the Tent of Meeting.[1] In this connection we are only concerned with Joshua. It does not appear that he was apart from the elders

[1] See *infra*, pp. 97–100, 106–107.

or that he had any functions to perform except to act as the "minister of Moses," in which capacity he would seem to have been present (ver. 28). But there is yet another passage in E (Deut. xxxi. 14 f.), and, as Van Hoonacker has acutely pointed out (Sacerdoce lévitique, p. 147, note), Joshua, so far from being permanently installed in the Tent, is summoned thither together with Moses. It is therefore patent that there is no justification whatever for holding that the ministry of any "sanctuary" was ever intrusted to the Ephraimite Joshua, or for throwing doubt on the priestly character of the family of Aaron and the Levites in E. The passages relating to the Tent of Meeting will be considered later,[1] but it is already apparent that they afford no foundation for Mr. Carpenter's remarks as to Joshua.

We return to the early chapters of Exodus. The next alleged criterion for the partition of these chapters is to be found in the rod.

THE ROD.

Mr. Carpenter's charge on this runs as follows:—

"The rod was one of the ancient elements of the tradition. Here it is represented as the shepherd's staff which was naturally in Moses' hands, and it becomes the medium of the display of the divine power to him. In E it is apparently given him by God 17, and consequently bears the name 'rod of God' 20b (cp 'mountain of God'): as such, it is the instrument with which Moses achieves the wonders vii 20b ix 23 x 13. P transfers the rod to Aaron, and supplies a different occasion for its conversion into a serpent cp vii 8–13." (Vol. ii. p. 84, note on Exodus iv. 2.)

We begin by disposing of Mr. Carpenter's comparison. We set out in the form of a syllogism the reasoning which alone could give it cogency:—

(*a*) "Mountain of God" can only mean mountain given by God:

[1] See *infra*, pp. 93–100, 106–107.

(*b*) *Mutatis mutandis,* "rod of God" can only mean the same thing as "mountain of God":

(*c*) Therefore "rod of God" can only mean rod given by God.

If for any reason the premises be rejected—and we imagine that it will be difficult to find anybody to adopt them—the conclusion falls to the ground. Obviously "rod of God" means nothing of the sort. It is merely a convenient expression for designating the rod which had been the instrument of a miracle. As to the words "take this rod" in verse 17, nobody who reads the narrative of this chapter continuously would understand this as referring to some rod that was given. The phrase is an entirely natural designation of the rod referred to in verses 1–3, and it requires a very captious reader indeed to misunderstand it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Carpenter is so firmly convinced that this rod must have been given by God and was not identical with the rod which had been turned into a snake, that in vii. 15 (E) he assigns the words "which was turned to a serpent" to a harmonist, and justifies himself thus: "A final harmonistic effort (15) identified the 'rod of God' which was expressly given to Moses for the purpose of working the signs (E) iv 17, 20b, with his own shepherd's staff (J) which had been turned into a snake iv 2 ff." (Vol. ii. p. 89.) As there is not a particle of evidence for the alleged gift, the remarks about the "final harmonistic effort" may reasonably afford much amusement.

But then Mr. Carpenter further alleges that "P transfers the rod to Aaron." So does J. In iv. 30 we read, "Aaron spake all the words which the LORD had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people." And Mr. Carpenter gets out of the difficulty only by invoking his never-

failing help in time of woe—the redactor—to conjure away "Moses" and "Aaron." It is impossible not to feel that he is here influenced by the theory which we have already examined, that Aaron was originally omitted altogether from these narratives.

There is in fact one difficulty connected with the rod; but, as that occurs in the narrative of the plagues, it will be better to postpone its discussion.[1]

THE PLAGUES.

We begin the consideration of this topic with an extract from a paper by the late W. H. Green.

"In reality, however, the plagues form a symmetrical and regularly unfolding scheme, as they stand in the record, without any confusion or derangement. The first nine plagues spontaneously divide themselves into three series of three each.

1.	(1) blood, vii. 14-25.	(4) flies, viii. 16-28.	(7) hail, ix. 13-35.
2.	(2) frogs, vii. 26-viii. 11.[2]	(5) murrain, ix. 1-7.	(8) locusts, x. 1-20.
3.	(3) lice, viii. 12-15.	(6) boils, ix. 8-12.	(9) darkness, x. 21-27.

"In each series the first and second are announced beforehand; the third is sent without warning. The regularly repeated formula in the first is with slight variations: 'And the LORD said unto Moses, Rise up early in the morning and stand before Pharaoh,—lo! he cometh forth to the water,—and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD (the God of the Hebrews), Let my people go that they may serve me; and if thou wilt not let my people go, behold I'. . . .

"The second of each series is introduced thus: 'And the LORD said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD (the God of the Hebrews), Let my people go that they may serve me; and if thou refuse to let them go, behold I'. . . .

"While the first in each series was thus pre-announced to the king by the river's side, and the second in his palace, the third was wrought without premonition, the LORD simply giving directions to Moses or to Moses and Aaron.

"This orderly arrangement of the plagues is rendered still more significant by their number, which cannot be merely the accidental result of combining separate accounts, which differ both in the number of the plagues and in the substance of the plagues themselves.

[1] See *infra*, p. 77.

[2] In A. V. viii. 1–15, with a corresponding change in the verses throughout chap. viii.

Nine follow in immediate succession, three times three, suggestive of the three degrees of comparison, each series rising to a climax, the final series the climax of all that preceded; and these are but the prelude to the tenth, which seals the completeness of the whole, like the ten digits and the ten commandments." (Hebraica, vol. vii. pp. 131–132.)

Mr. Carpenter's introductory note on the subject begins as follows:—

"The narrative of the wonders vii 8–xi 10 is plainly composite. Various reasons unite to enforce this conclusion; the following analysis is founded on two broad classes of evidence, (α) material differences of representation, and (β) accompanying peculiarities of phraseology. (1) Scattered through the record occur short sections of which vii 8–13 is the type. They are based on the idea of 'showing a wonder' vii 9. Moses receives the divine command, and transmits it to Aaron, who executes it with his rod: the magicians of Egypt then attempt to produce the same marvel, at first with success, but afterwards impotently: the heart of Pharaoh is strong, and he will not listen. These common marks unite the following passages: vii 8–13, 19–20a, 22 viii 5–7, 15b, 16–19 ix 8–12. They are unconnected by any marks of time; they constitute a succession of displays of power increasing in force until the editorial close in xi 10. Their recurring phrases (see the margins), the peculiar relation of Moses and Aaron cp vii 1 f, the prominence assigned to Aaron as the agent of the wonders with his rod cp Num xvii 8, while elsewhere the wonder is wrought by Moses with his rod, justify the ascription of these passages to P. Some points of linguistic affinity with JE are of course inevitable, in travelling over so much common ground." (Vol. ii. p. 88.)

Reserving for the present the alleged literary evidence, we proceed to investigate Mr. Carpenter's grave misrepresentations on the other points.

First, it is quite untrue that any of the passages cited, except vii. 8–12, "is based on the idea of showing a wonder." In that passage Pharaoh *asks for* a wonder. There is not the slightest hint of anything of the kind in the other passages. Moreover, vii. 9 contemplates the showing of a single wonder, not of five.

Secondly, the allegation that in all these passages "Moses

receives the divine command and transmits it to Aaron, who executes it with his rod," is also false. In ix. 8–12 the command is given not to Moses, but to Moses and Aaron. It is not transmitted to Aaron, nor is it executed by him, nor does his rod enter into the action.

Thirdly, the magicians of Egypt are not here stated to have attempted to produce the same marvel.

The relation of Moses and Aaron has already been discussed.

It may therefore be confidently said that this portion of the analysis cannot be supported. Mr. Carpenter's note on vii. 8 then proceeds to effect the division between J and E, partly on the ground of the alleged distinction between Goshen and Egypt (already considered), and partly on the ground that in some passages Moses wields a rod and in others he does not. He writes: "Again the agency by which the plagues are successively induced, varies on different occasions. In one series Moses simply announces to Pharaoh the divine intention, but in another he is directed to stretch out his hand that the visitation may follow ix 22 x 12, 21 (cp ix 29, 33). The hand of Moses wields the rod ix 23 x 13 cp 22 vii 20b, apparently the rod of iv 17 expressly given to him for the purpose" [!]. That is to say, no discrepancy is alleged, but in Mr. Carpenter's opinion it was impossible for either J or E to compose a narrative relating a succession of plagues, some of which were initiated in one way and some in another. This was quite possible for P, who is allowed to tell of a number of signs that were initiated by Aaron's rod, and also of one that was begun by the action of Moses in casting handfuls of dust to heaven; but J and E are not as P and must not be allowed the same license. Besides, Mr. Carpenter did not really allow P to do this. He shut his eyes to P's actions and al-

leged that he had done something else. Hence he cannot conceive such conduct in J or E.

With regard to "the rod of iv 17 expressly given to him for the purpose" we must recall the fact that Mr. Carpenter is able to make this out only by banishing from vii. 15 the phrase which proves this to be the rod that was turned into a serpent. We have already discussed the alleged gift, but we have now to see how the rod is eliminated from J. Mr. Carpenter continues: "The coincidence of (i) [i.e. the presence in Egypt, not Goshen] and (ii) [i.e. the rod] in x 21–23 secures all the rod-passages to E. It will be noticed that these contain no mention of Aaron; Moses throughout appears alone; act after act follows without recorded speech." We have already dealt with the presence of Aaron in E. It will be noticed that the assignment of the rod-passages to E rests on nothing more secure than the theory that residence in Goshen excludes the proximity of Egyptians. It need only be added that the other statements are simply due to the arbitrary division adopted. Thus x. 28 f. are assigned to J without so much as a pretense that there is any reason for it, though the preceding verse is given to E. Any narrative in the world could be divided on these principles.

It remains to notice the other points as to material representation on the narrative of the plagues. We read in vii. 25, "And seven days were fulfilled, after that the LORD had smitten the river." On the strength of this, Mr. Carpenter writes as follows in his note on 14a: "In the formula 'Thus saith the LORD . . . . Behold I will smite,' the LORD is obviously the subject of the verb cp viii 1 f, 20 f ix 13, 18 x 3 f, and it is plain from 25 that the writer conceived of the LORD as himself smiting the river [!], with the result that the fish died (18, 21), and the Egyptians could not drink the water."

(Vol. ii. p. 89.) And this man apparently conceives that he is qualified to act as a *literary* critic!

The next point is not less marvelous. In ix. 6 we read that "all the cattle of Egypt died." By the context (verse 3) this is in effect limited to the cattle in the field, but Mr. Carpenter is not in the habit of attending to the context of any statement, and it pleases him, moreover, to treat "all" as a mathematical term. Therefore on 19 he gravely prints the following: "According to ix 6 'the cattle of Egypt' are already all dead, and in 25b, consequently, the destructive effect of the hail is limited to trees and herbs [Mr. Carpenter achieves this by giving the first half of 25 to E and the second to J]. The prediction of the death of the cattle which should be exposed to the storm, must therefore be regarded as an editorial afterthought in reference to 25a." And on verse 22: "When it is further added 'that there may be hail on man and *upon beast* throughout the land of Egypt,' it becomes plain that this passage cannot proceed from the writer of 6!" Hence again in xi 5 we are told that "and all the firstborn of cattle" is "probably a late editorial addition. The 'cattle' of Egypt (מקנה) had already been killed ix 6; the term here employed, 'beast,' as in xiii 12, 15, suggests the presence of the harmonizer, anxious to find a basis for legal usage in the sacred tradition." (Vol. ii. p. 96.) Similarly with xii. 29. We are surprised that Mr. Carpenter does not on the same principle argue that ix. 14 must relate to the introduction of the story of the plagues on the ground that God speaks of sending "all" his plagues. Similarly Dr. G. B. Gray argues that Numbers xxxi. must be unhistorical, because (amongst other reasons) "if it were historical, then, since *every* male Midianite was slain, Midian must have disappeared from history in the time of Moses; and this conclusion would conflict with the prominent part played

by Midian in the Book of Judges (vi.–viii.), not to speak of later references [!]." (Numbers, pp. 418–419.) And Dr. Baentsch, the author of another higher critical commentary on Numbers, thinks it necessary to point out solemnly on verse 7 (every male), that, according to verse 17, the male children were not included in this! We can only express the hope that a time may come when some sympathy with the Hebrew genius and its methods of expression may be deemed an indispensable precondition to the task of producing a commentary on a Hebrew book.

There thus remains *one* difficulty in the narrative of the plagues. In Exodus vii. 17 God in speaking to Moses commands him to say, "Behold I will smite with the rod that is in *mine* hand"; whereas, in 19, He says, "Say unto Aaron, Take *thy* rod," etc. The passages are certainly not incapable of being harmonized, but there is perhaps a little awkwardness in the phrase "take thy rod," which would disappear if, for example, "take *the* rod" could be read. It is of course not impossible that there is some slight corruption in the text, and that it has been emended on the basis of verse 8, where the phrase is decidedly in place; but no variant is recorded in Kittel's "Biblia Hebraica." The editions of the Septuagint by Swete and Lagarde give no help: and the Samaritan text is here manifestly inferior. On the whole, we are of the opinion that different minds will be likely to take different views, some holding that the text is correct as it stands, while others may favor some hypothesis of corruption. In any case the awkwardness here is the only point we have discovered in the narrative of the plagues that can be reasonably held to create any difficulty at all.[1]

[1] Part ii. of the first volume of the larger Cambridge Septuagint now records "the rod" as an extant variant, but this need not necessarily represent a different Hebrew.

By the means we have considered, Mr. Carpenter produces the following table of the plagues (vol. ii. p. 89), which should be carefully contrasted with Dr. Green's table given above.

J	E	P
		Aaron's rod changed to a serpent
The river smitten, death of the fish	Waters of the river turned to blood	Waters of Egypt turned to blood
Frogs		Frogs
		Lice
Flies		
Murrain		
		Boils
Hail	Hail	
Locusts	Locusts	
	Darkness	
Death of the first-born	[Death of the first-born]	Death of the first-born

It is to be noticed that no system whatever is traceable either in the number of the plagues, or in the method of their execution or their significance, or in the relation of the documents to one another. In Mr. Carpenter's scheme we simply have aimless collections of fragments—nothing more.

THE SO-CALLED LITERARY EVIDENCE.

Nothing is more astonishing in the higher criticism than the arguments which by a desecration of language are termed "literary." Literary criticism cannot exist apart from literary feeling, and it takes but a very few minutes to see that this quality is entirely absent from the higher critical work. It would be difficult to conceive anything more hopelessly unliterary than the evidence produced under this head. And it must be remembered that the lists of words adduced are further vitiated by the characteristics that we have seen at work in the statements as to material differences—the lack of care, accuracy, thoroughness, judgment, and impartiality that constitute the outstanding features of all the higher critical work. Opening Volume I. of the Oxford Hexateuch at random at

the lists of words, we take two or three instances from the page (187) on which we happened to light. The phrases are alleged to be characteristic of J:—No. 34, "flowing with milk and honey"—said to be used 8 times by J, 7 times by D and once by P^h (the Holiness legislation—a separate code now incorporated in P); No. 36, "from the time that," 4 J, 1 R^d; No. 38, "to do good," 9 J, 2 E, 10 D, 2 P; and so on. This sort of thing is mere trifling. If a phrase can be used by any two or three or four of the alleged documents and redactors, it is obvious that there is nothing distinctive about it. And in estimating these lists other considerations must also be borne in mind. It quite frequently happens that the division of the documents by various critics is not identical. In such cases the lists of words break down. Again, there is much circular reasoning. The critics will say that a particular source uses a given word, and adduce, in triumphant justification of their dictum, passages which have been attributed to that source only on the ground of the occurrence of this very word. To take an illustration: in Exodus iii. 19 we find a particular use of the infinitive. This is assigned by the editors of the new English edition of Gesenius's Hebrew lexicon to J, but by Mr. Carpenter to a redactor on the ground partly that this is an E phrase. Then this phrase is quoted in the E list of words to distinguish E from other documents. Moreover, redactors are perpetually called in to account for unpleasant facts. Indeed, it may safely be said that the allegations as to the literary evidence are quite as unreliable as the other assertions of the critics. We have recently treated of the question at some length in the *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1907, and we do not propose to enter at all fully into the matter in these essays, but Mr. Carpenter's table in the note on vii. 8 may be given as a fair example.

J	E	P
Pharaoh 'refuses to let the people go' vii 14 viii 2 ix 2 x 4.		
'The LORD, God of the Hebrews,' vii 16 ix 1, 13 x 3.		'Say unto Aaron' vii 9, 19 viii 5, 16.
'Let my people go that they may serve me' vii 16 viii 1, 20 ix 1, 13 x 3.		The magicians vii 11, 22 viii 7, 18 ix 11.
'Thus saith the LORD . . . Behold I will . . .' vii 17 viii 1 f, 20 f ix 1 (3), 13, 18 x 3 f.	Moses stretches out his hand with the rod vii 15, 20b ix 22 f x 12 f, 21 f.	Aaron stretches out his hand with his rod vii 9, 19 viii 5 f, 16 f.
'Intreat the LORD' viii 8, 28 ix 28 x 17.		Land of Egypt vii 19, 21b viii 5–7, 16 f ix 9ab xii 1, 12 f, 17, 41 f, 51.
'Removal of the plague viii 8, 31 x 17 cp ix 33.		
Marks of time 'to-morrow' viii 10, 23, 29 ix 5 f x 4.		
Unheard of character of the infliction ix 18, 24b x 6b, 14 xi 6.		
Pharaoh's heart 'stubborn' (Qal & Hiph) vii 14 viii 15, 32 ix 7, 34.	Pharaoh's heart 'strong' (Qal & Hiph) ix 35 x 20, 27.	Pharaoh's heart 'strong' (Qal & Hiph) vii 13, 22 viii 19 (ix 12 Pl).
		And he hearkened not as the LORD had spoken vii 10, 13, 22 viii 15, 19 ix 12.

Examination shows how purely factitious this list is. We have already seen that in E, act is made to follow act without recorded speech. Hence every phrase that is natural in dialogue must be assigned to J or P. The view taken by Mr. Carpenter of the relations of Moses and Aaron further enables him to assign to P phrases in which Aaron occurs. And so on. "Land of Egypt," which is here quoted as characteristic of P, is a phrase which elsewhere J and E are permitted to use; e.g., ix. 23b and 24b (both J), 25a (E), etc. There is nothing in this style of argument that would detain a man of common sense and ordinary judgment for five minutes. At one

moment Mr. Carpenter alleges that certain verses must belong to P because the phrase "land of Egypt" occurs, and then in the same chapter he allows other verses to go to other sources in spite of the fact that the very same phrase is found in them. If higher critics regard this sort of thing as convincing, we shall be pleased to let them have a monopoly of it. But we have thought it right to say a few words about this alleged "literary method," lest it should be thought that it is in any way more substantial than the rest of the critical case. Before passing away from it we should like to give a sample of what the critics are prepared to believe on the strength of such evidence. The following is the assignment of Exodus xiii. 3–16 in the Oxford Hexateuch:—

EXODUS XIII.

3. J:—And Moses said unto the people,
Harmonizing addition by Rje [i.e. the redactor of J and E]:—Remember this day in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand the LORD brought you from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten.
4. J:—This day ye go forth in the month Abib.
5. *Supplement by a writer of the J School* (Js):—And it shall be when the LORD shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Amorite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite, which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month.
6. J:—Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the LORD.
7. Js [See 5 supra]:—Unleavened bread shall be eaten throughout the seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee, in all thy borders.
8. And thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying, it is because of that which the LORD did for me when I came forth out of Egypt.
9. *A priestly redactor* (Rp):—And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the law of the LORD may be in thy mouth:
Rje [see supra 3]:—For with a strong hand hath the LORD brought thee out of Egypt.
10–13. J. 14–16. Rje.

And this is regarded as scholarship!

CHAPTER III.

INSPIRITED by the remarkable results of their labors on the narrative of the plagues, the critics turn with zeal to the crossing of the Red Sea. "The triple narrative of the plagues," writes Mr. Carpenter, "raises the presumption that the passage of the Red Sea was also related by all the three documents J, E, and P." (Vol. ii. p. 99, note on Exodus xiii. 17.) The rest of this note contains nothing that need detain us, being devoted to phrases like "make strong the heart" and similar matters, but verse 21 brings us to the first appearance of the pillar of cloud, and this is one of the main arguments for the partition of the narrative of the middle books. The Glory and the position of the Ark and the Tent of Meeting are necessarily involved in any discussion of the Cloud, and we purpose therefore to dispose of these topics without further delay.

THE CLOUD.

"Three representations of the divine presence in the cloud [writes Mr. Carpenter, on Ex. xiii. 21] are to be found in the Hexateuch. In P it covers the Dwelling at its consecration Ex xl 34 ff Num ix 15 ff, and remains over the Tent of Meeting until it is time for the camp to be moved, when it is taken up. A second set of passages also connects it with the Tent of Meeting, but places it at the entrance, where it comes down in the form of a pillar and remains in converse with Moses Ex xxxiii 7 f Num xii 5 cp Deut xxxi 15: reasons will be given hereafter for ascribing these to E. But in the

text 21 [i.e. Ex. xiii. 21]nothing has yet been said of any sanctuary; the pillar with its twofold aspect by day or night serves another function, that of guidance and protection. In xiv 19 two symbols, the angel of Elohim, and the pillar, have been combined by R. As the 'angel of Elohim' naturally belongs to E, the guardian pillar must be regarded as the equivalent in J." (Vol. ii. p. 100.)

That passage may serve as an introduction to the higher critical case. In reply we intend to prove the following points: (1) It is not true that in P the cloud first makes its appearance at the erection of the Dwelling. On the contrary it is found before then and *in the same position* as in J. (2) The Lord comes down in a cloud in J as well as in E, but in both documents this is only on certain occasions. (3) Otherwise E locates the cloud in exactly the same position as J. (4) The discrepancy between P and JE can be manufactured only by the help of the redactor.

The pillar of cloud in Exodus xiii. 21 and 22 (J) really calls for no remark. The passage is entirely suitable to the first appearance of the cloud, and gives the necessary explanation of its presence.[1] The next passage is xiv. 19–20. We begin by printing the portion assigned to E continuously: "And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; . . . and came between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel; and there was the cloud and the darkness." This at once disposes of Mr. Carpenter's statement that "two symbols, the angel of Elohim, and the pillar, have been combined by R," for we see that when E has been disentangled it still recognizes the cloud either in addition to or as covering the angel. The representation is in fact exactly the same as in J when we remember that Hebrew thought did not always draw a sharp distinction between God and his angel,

[1] It will, however, hereafter be argued that these verses should be followed immediately by Exodus xxxiii. 7–11, a passage which is at present out of place.

the latter being regarded as a manifestation of Him. Many commentators think there is some corruption in verse 20; but, unless Mr. Carpenter can prove that the angel did not appear in the cloud,—and he is wise enough not even to suggest this,—the attempt to establish a discrepancy between J and E breaks down. It must be conceded that these two documents display precisely the same conception of the position of the cloud at this juncture.

The next passage is Exodus xvi. 10 (P). On this Mr. Carpenter, in his note on verse 2, writes as follows:—

"But the story implies the existence of the Levitical Dwelling with the ark containing the Sacred Testimony 34. It is not till the Dwelling is completed that 'the Glory of the LORD' (10) first appears in the cloud cp xl 34 ff. . . . Nor can the narrative be relieved of this anachronism by viewing 33 f as a later addition. The phrase in 9 'come near before the LORD' similarly describes attendance at the sanctuary cp Lev ix 5 xvi 1 Num xviii 22. The story, then, in its present form implies the existence of a centre of worship which is not yet constructed, and must have been transposed to its present place from a later stage." (Vol. ii. pp. 104, 105.)

We confess that in reading the higher critics we often feel how much their writings would gain in accuracy if they were to be "redacted" by somebody who treated them on the principle which they apply to the Pentateuch. It makes our mouth water to think how many of Mr. Carpenter's most questionable statements could be rendered quite defensible by such simple expedients as the judicious insertion of negative adverbs. Here is an instance. Suppose that for "implies" we write "does not imply" (or, better still, "excludes"), the first portion of the last sentence becomes absolutely accurate. For what does the chapter say? Moses tells Aaron to command the congregation to come near before the Lord. If this narrative implied the existence of the sanctuary, it is obvious that this must have directed their attention to the center of the camp. But it did

nothing of the sort. The Israelites—who appear not to have been informed that they were in a misplaced passage of P—were perverse enough to behave just as if they had been living in J or E. As yet the only symbol of the Divine presence was the cloud which went before them and had not yet removed to the Dwelling. Accordingly we are told that they looked in the direction of the wilderness (ver. 10). They seem indeed to have interpreted the command to come near before the Lord as referring to the visible symbol of his presence. Worse, still, their perversity was rewarded by seeing the glory appear in the cloud. And Mr. Carpenter does not even consign "the wilderness" to a redactor!

Dr. George Buchanan Gray does not take the matter so quietly. On page 154 of his volume on Numbers, he peremptorily orders his readers to read "tabernacle" for "wilderness." No reason is assigned for the command—we think wisely.

It will be observed that in the passage we have quoted Mr. Carpenter asserts that the story "must have been transposed to its present place from a later stage." Similarly Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 86) says: "Ex. xvi 6–10 is a misplaced narrative." We have no prejudice against transpositions—indeed we hope to propose some on our own account hereafter: but we would suggest to these gentlemen that before putting forward their schemes in future they should examine the chapters that they desire to transpose for *indicia* of place. In the present instance the first verse contains an important date—the fifteenth day of the second month. P, to whom this is attributed, does not bring the children of Israel to Sinai until the third month (xix. 1). It follows that he cannot have intended this story to relate to a subsequent period. That the children of Israel should have begun to live on manna very

soon after their departure from Egypt is so obviously in accordance with the necessities of the case that nobody would ever have questioned the position of the narrative but for the desire to manufacture contradictions.

It should also be noticed that Mr. Carpenter's allegation that it is not till the dwelling is completed that the 'Glory of the LORD' first appears in the cloud" is quite incapable of being supported. The glory is found in the cloud over Sinai (xxiv. 16).

The reference to verse 33 which commands the deposit of a pot of manna in the sanctuary offers no criterion of the date to which the narrative of the earlier portion of the chapter relates. It is easily conceivable that either the original historian or (more probably) a subsequent editor should have here adopted a topical order and disposed of the divine command relating to the manna.

As Dr. Gray has been mentioned, we may pause to correct some of his statements. He writes (Numbers, p. 113) of the cloud that, "in both E and P, as distinguished from J, it is regularly associated with the tabernacle." We have seen that this is not true of E before Sinai, and the present passage (as also Ex. xxiv.) proves the same of P. On page 86 we read: "The cloud, according to P, first appeared at Sinai. . . . Before reaching Sinai, the Israelites marched according to the commandment of the LORD, Ex. xvii 1; such definite direction they still required; for the cloud in P does not, as in J (Ex. xiii 22), move at the head of the whole host to show the way." This statement as to the position of the cloud in P on the march is scarcely in harmony with Numbers ix. 17: "And in the place where the cloud abode, there the children of Israel encamped." This would naturally be understood as meaning that the cloud was in front during the march.

After Exodus xvi. the cloud is next mentioned in connection with the stay at Sinai. In xix. 9 (E) we read: "Behold, I come unto thee in a thick cloud," in verse 16 the same writer speaks of a thick cloud, and in xx. 21 he refers to it as thick darkness. We draw special attention to this, as it disproves the allegation of Dr. G. B. Gray (Encyclopædia Biblica, col. 3777) that "P differs . . . . from both E and J with regard to the form of the phenomenon." He explains this by adding: "Not only does P never use the term pillar; he speaks of the cloud in ways which do not suggest, and perhaps exclude such a form." Clearly E could do the same on occasion, and we shall see directly that J also could.

Exodus xxiv. 15b brings us to what the critics desire to regard as the first mention of the cloud in P—for it must be remembered that Exodus xvi. is "misplaced." P not unnaturally begins by speaking of "the cloud" as if it had been mentioned before. Mr. Carpenter offers no explanation of this: but to most readers it will seem that the article here refers to the last mention, which happens to be in E.

In Exodus xxxiii. 9 (E) we find the pillar of cloud descending, but exactly the same conception appears in xxxiv. 5 (J), and in P we also read of the cloud's rising and descending. In xxxiv. J is actually thoughtless enough to speak of the cloud—not the "pillar." Yet Dr. Gray writes in the Encyclopædia Biblica: "Deuteronomy i 33 is dependent on J, though the term pillar is not used" (col. 3776). In xl. 34 a late priestly writer once more speaks of *the* cloud, and tells how it came to occupy a position in the center of the camp. So that, if the narrative be read continuously, it appears that J, E and P all agree, and that no discrepancy can be proved.

We shall consider together Numbers x. 34: "And the cloud of the LORD was over them by day, when they set forward

from the camp," and Numbers xiv. 14: "For thou, O LORD, art seen face to face, and thy cloud standeth over them, and thou goest before them, in a pillar of cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night." Mr. Carpenter deals with these two passages, which contain precisely the same idea, in the following manner: The first is consigned to a late priestly stratum. The note informs us that "the description of the cloud as 'over' the advancing Israelites at once separates this statement from the narrative of J in which it is conceived as going before them xiv 14b Ex xiii 21 as a pillar. In P, on the other hand, it is always above them without definite form cp ix 17 ff." We have already seen the cloud descending in J—which implies elevation—and we have also found J (and D based on J) speaking of the cloud without the word "pillar." As to xiv. 14 Mr. Carpenter assigns the bulk of the verse to R^{Je} (i.e. the redactor of J and E), but invokes another redactor, R^{D} (i.e. the priestly redactor), to redact the earlier redactor, and so disposes of the words "and thy cloud standeth over them," alleging, in the note *ad loc.*, that "this clause seems due to a reminiscence of the account of the Dwelling in the midst of the camp and the cloud above it." Yet it should be tolerably obvious that "standing" and "going before" are mutually exclusive, and refer to the people in camp and on the march respectively.

We must just mention that in a late stratum of E (Num. xii. 5) the LORD comes down in a pillar of cloud, but in xii. 10 and xi. 25, "the cloud" is spoken of in the same stratum without the word pillar. We need not linger over any other passage.

To sum up. As to the form: Both J and E speak sometimes of the pillar and sometimes of the cloud. In Exodus xix. (E) the cloud can scarcely have been in the form of a pillar, and the representation is precisely the same as that found

more frequently in P. It is not difficult to understand that the shape varied with the occasion in the Pentateuch as a whole, as it certainly did in E. As to the position: P and J and E place the cloud in exactly the same position before Sinai. At Sinai it appears to have been in the first instance over the mountain in all the documents, but it descends sometimes for Moses. Accordingly in all three documents it is high up on normal occasions, that is above the Israelites. When the Tabernacle is erected it takes its normal position in the center of the camp over the sanctuary. In P and J it normally precedes the Israelites on the march after Sinai, but there is no sufficient indication of the exact form it assumes in P. In all three documents it is normally high up after Sinai, but in E it sometimes descends. We have seen it doing the same in J, and it will be found that it behaves likewise in Leviticus xvi. 2 (P). But on different occasions the descents occur in different places. It is of course suggested that in E the Tent of Meeting stood outside the camp after Sinai, and that would place the cloud in a different position, but we shall shortly see that this critical theory cannot be supported either.[1] A division into discrepant sources can of course be effected by the process of tearing the Pentateuch up and dividing the shreds between documents, redactors, and redactors of redactors; but this applies equally to any narrative in the world. On the other hand we are bound to point out that the statements of Messrs. Carpenter and Gray on the topics involved are marked by a recklessness and an inaccuracy which may doubtless be paralleled with supreme ease from almost any publication of the

[1] *Infra*, pp. 98–102. On the other hand, it will be argued that before Sinai there was a tent of meeting which was frequently placed outside the camp, and that it is to this period that Exodus xxxiii. 7–11 relates (*infra, loc. cit.*, and pp. 106 f.).

Wellhausen school, but are elsewhere not common in literature that professes to be scholarly.

THE GLORY.

This is so closely related to the cloud that we take it next. Dr. Gray writes thus on page 154 of his commentary on Numbers: "According to P, *the glory of the Lord* was a fiery appearance manifesting the divine presence. . . . P's conception of the glory of the LORD is markedly different from that of other Hexateuchal sources." On page 158, in reference to xiv. 21 (redactor of JE), he adds: "Here and in the next verse, *the glory of the Lord* is the revelation of His character and power in history." Yet something very like the latter conception occurs in P also. In Exodus xxix. 43 (P) the Hebrew has: "And it [Greek and Syriac "I"] shall be sanctified by my glory." This can hardly be the fiery appearance.[1] On the other hand, in Exodus xxxiii. 18, 22 (secondary stratum of J) it cannot be claimed that the glory is a "revelation of God's character and power in history." This contention, therefore, goes the way of Dr. Gray's other assertions.

We pass to a more important matter.

THE POSITION OF THE ARK.

Mr. Carpenter has slightly modified the language of one of his observations on this topic in the "Composition of the Hexateuch" (1902), which is a second edition of Volume I. of his Hexateuch. We therefore quote the later work. The passages we have to examine are three in number.

[1] We think the same applies to Exodus xvi. 7. The glory of the LORD is there manifested in the morning by the manna. Perhaps verses 9–12 should stand before 6–8. In that case they would owe their present position to the misunderstanding of somebody who confused the "glory" of verse 7 with the fiery "glory" of verse 10. and therefore thought that verse 7 was a prediction of the occurrence related in verse 10.

(1) Of J:—"The ark is mentioned Num x 33, and appears (contrary to E's view of the sanctuary chap xii §2ϵ) to have been habitually guarded in the centre of the camp Num xiv 44." (Composition, p. 183.)

(2) Of E:—"The Mosaic sanctuary, however, is of a different order. It is a tent, fit for the conditions of nomad life in the desert, pitched outside the camp xxxiii 7 ff, bearing the name of the Tent of Meeting. . . . It was no doubt intended to enshrine the ark, which in its turn held the sacred stones." (Composition, p. 209=Hexateuch, vol. i. p. 114. This is the passage referred to in the last extract as chap xii §2ϵ.)

(3) "The Tent of Meeting is still outside long after the camp order has been established Num xi 24–30 xii 4. It is in harmony with this representation of the isolation of the sanctuary that the ark does not travel in the midst of the tribes, but in front of them x 33." (Composition, p. 49=Hexateuch, vol. i. p. 30.)

Now unfortunately Numbers x. 33 belongs to J, who, according to extract (1), represented the ark as being "habitually guarded in the centre of the camp." Therefore its position on the march is no criterion of its position in camp.

In treating of the position of the Ark we take its position on the march first. In the Pentateuch there are two passages in J. The first is Numbers x. 33: "The ark . . . . went before them three days' journey, to seek out a resting place for them." The second is the passage (verses 35 f.) where we are told what Moses said when it set forward and when it rested. Most modern commentators think—no doubt rightly—that the words "three days' journey" (in the second part of x. 33) are due to dittography, and should be expelled from the text. This is borne out by the second passage, as Moses would not have been in a position to say anything if the Ark had been three days' journey distant. Then reading 34 ff. continuously it becomes clear that the Ark led the way with the cloud over it. It is alleged by Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 93) that in verse 21 (P) "the ark is carried in the midst of the people," but his reference does not support his statement, particularly as he in-

sists that in that verse מקדש cannot mean "sanctuary," but must be rendered "holy things." Certainly any fair reader finding the statement "And the Kohathites set forward, bearing the holy things . . . . and the ark . . . . went before them to seek out a resting place for them," would not infer an inconsistency. He might hold that the ark was not here included in the expression "holy things," or he might infer that this position of the ark was abnormal, and intended only for the three days' journey. And he would be strengthened in this view by a further fact, a fact that even a whole army of indefatigable redactors could not eliminate. Perhaps, after what we have seen of the higher critical methods, some readers may feel tempted to ask whether there is anything for which one or more redactors cannot be held responsible. We think there is; for it happens that the whole book of Joshua has slipped from the minds of Messrs. Carpenter and Gray! We turn to Joshua iii. f. Omitting a few harmonists and glossators, this narrative is adroitly divided between J, E, a Deuteronomic reviser and a late priestly stratum; and, alack-a-day! all these four separate individuals treat of the Ark in precisely the same manner. And none of these sources—not even P^s, who ought surely to support our critics in a matter of this kind—knows anything of Dr. Gray's position for the Ark. After this it is scarcely necessary to add that Joshua vi. has also been neglected by our commentators, but it too shows clearly that the Ark (which was a portable object) was not always or necessarily in the same position, even in JE.

It is therefore quite impossible to manufacture any discrepancy between the various sources with regard to the position of the Ark on the march.

We turn to its position in the camp. It appears from the passages cited by Mr. Carpenter, and also Joshua vii. 6, that J

locates the ark in the camp. So does P (Ex. xl. 20 ff.). And E? Except on the march he is never permitted to mention the ark at all, either in the Pentateuch or Joshua. The only "evidence" that in his view the ark was kept outside the camp is the fact that when Moses (in Ex. xxxiii.) pitched the Tent there *before the ark had come into existence*, he did not take the ark with him. And indeed the Hebrew text of the passage expressly states that Moses pitched the Tent for himself (not for the ark). Probably that is why Mr. Carpenter writes that the Tent pitched outside "was no doubt intended to enshrine the ark." We have observed that a really good higher critic who has no evidence for what he wishes to believe habitually asserts that it was "doubtless" so, or "must have been" so, or uses some other similar phrase to supply the lack of evidence. But as E in Joshua represents the ark as being under the charge of priests (not of Moses or his minister), it is clear that he did not conceive of Moses as taking the non-existent ark outside the camp with him. It therefore appears that here again the critical case breaks down hopelessly under examination.

THE TENT OF MEETING.

Mr. Carpenter's case on this is stated as follows:—

"In Ex xxxiii 7 ff Num xi 24 ff xii 4 ff the Tent of Meeting is pitched outside the camp. The first of these passages assumes the existence of the tent and describes the sacred usage connected with it: the others supply incidental confirmation by depicting incidents which happened at its door. With these conceptions Dt xxxi 14 f is in harmony. It is a singular circumstance that (in the present text) the first mention of the place of this Tent Ex xxxiii 7 ff represents it as in actual use before it was made. It is a part of the sanctuary which is to be constructed xxvii 21 xxviii 43 xxix 4 ff xxx 16 ff xxxi 7; but its preparation is not begun till after the second sojourn of Moses on the Mount xxxiv, its erection being solemnly completed xl 2–33. Must it not be admitted that the two long corresponding sections xxv–xxx and xxxv–xl together with Num ii–iii present an

account which is entirely independent of the story in Ex xxxiii 7 ff and inconsistent with it?" (Vol. i. pp. 51–52.)

Professor Van Hoonacker, a great and singularly acute scholar, has suggested a series of transpositions on page 146 of his "Sacerdoce lévitique," with a view to removing the difficulty. On testing his theory we found it unworkable; but, out of respect for him, we begin by setting it out, together with the facts that disprove it. In the first column of the following table we give the order suggested by the Professor, in the second the indications of the places at which the various incidents occurred, and in the third the parallel data of Numbers xxxiii. It will be seen that columns 2 and 3 disprove column 1.

PROF. VAN HOONACKER'S PROPOSED ORDER.	INDICATIONS OF PLACE IN THE PASSAGES NAMED.	DATA OF NUM. XXXIII.
Ex xv	ver 27 people come to Elim and encamp there	Num xxxiii ver 9 reach Elim ver 10 Red Sea
Ex xxxiii 7–11	No indication of place except what may be gleaned from the Tent and its position	
Ex xvi 1	The people leave Elim and come to the wilderness of Sin between Elim and Sinai	ver 11 wilderness of Sin ver 12 Dophkah
Num xi 1–32 (less 6b–9 assigned to a redactor)	Taberah (ver 3)	ver 13 Alush
Num xii	Apparently the scene is Hazeroth which the people leave (ver 16) for the wilderness of Paran	
Ex xvii and further (unspecified) narratives leading to	ver 1. The Israelites leave the wilderness of Sin and pitch in Rephidim: 6 Horeb mentioned: 7 the place called Massah and Meribah	ver 14 Rephidim no water to drink ver 15 wilderness of Sinai

PROF. VAN HOONACKER'S PROPOSED ORDER.	INDICATIONS OF PLACE IN THE PASSAGES NAMED.	DATA OF NUM. XXXIII.
Num x	ver 12 leave the wilderness of Sinai for the wilderness of Paran: verse 33 set forward from the Mount of the LORD, three days' journey	
Ex xvi 2–36	No place named, but (ver 11) the cloud is not in the centre of the camp (see *supra* on the cloud)	
Num xi 33–4	The place called Kibroth-hattaavah	ver 16 Kibroth-hattaavah
Num xiii ff	ver 3 wilderness of Paran	ver 17 Hazeroth

Numbers xi. 35 appears to be left out of the scheme altogether.

Now apart from the unsatisfactory treatment of this verse and Numbers xi. 6b–9 (assigned to a redactor), it is evident that the scheme breaks down through the impossible order of the places. Stated continuously they are as follows: Elim, wilderness of Sin, Taberah, Hazeroth, wilderness of Paran, then suddenly the Israelites leave the wilderness of Sin for Rephidim. Next they leave the wilderness of Sinai and set out for the wilderness of Paran, then the cloud is not in the center of the camp (pointing to pre-Sinaitic days), then Kibroth-hattaavah, and lastly Paran. And if the order proposed breaks down for internal reasons, it is also difficult to reconcile with the external testimony of Numbers xxxiii. We are, therefore, justified in looking for the solution elsewhere. But it is highly characteristic of the stimulating quality of Professor Van Hoonacker's work that the view which we have to propound grew out of a train of thought which was originally suggested to us by the very note in which the above transposi-

tions are put forward: and we desire to acknowledge the benefit we have derived from his work in this as in other instances.[1]

In dealing with this question, it is important that we should understand exactly what the case is that we have to meet. It is said that in E the tent is outside the camp, but in P (and probably J) it is in the center of the camp. Bound up with this are statements that in E Joshua is the custodian of the sanctuary, that E (in contrast to J and P) locates the Ark outside the camp, that the cloud is in a different position, and so on. We have already disposed of all these subsidiary allegations, and are therefore free to consider the main proposition in all its nakedness. Is it the case that E represents that Tent which elsewhere stands in the center of the camp as being pitched outside it?

We begin by eliminating Deuteronomy xxxi. 14 f. (E), which, according to Mr. Carpenter, is "in harmony with" the

[1] We wish, however, to add a few remarks on one or two other points.

(*a*) As to the Taberah incident. Professor Van Hoonacker here relies on Deuteronomy ix. 22, where Taberah, Massah, Kibroth-hattaavah, are mentioned in the order named. It may be questioned whether this is sufficient evidence to warrant a transposition at all. If it be, perhaps the Deuteronomy names are in the wrong order, not the Numbers narratives. Assuming, however, that Deuteronomy be held to evidence derangement in the latter, we think the transposition should affect only xi. 1–3. The episode of the quails in this chapter stands in intimate relation with the name Kibroth-hattaavah (ver. 33), which the Deuteronomy verse dissociates from Taberah. Hence the very passage which is advanced for the transposition of verses 1–3 affords an argument for retaining the present position of verses 4–35. (*b*) As to the seventy elders: Professor Van Hoonacker thinks that Exodus xxiv. 1 assumes the narrative of Numbers xi. 16 ff. We cannot agree. Indeed, we think that if, at the time Moses ascended the mountain, seventy elders had already been invested with a portion of his spirit, the arrangement by which Aaron and Hur were intrusted with judicial business would probably have been unnecessary, or at any rate would have utilized the seventy in some way. In Exodus the elders are present to rep-

representation attributed to E. If that passage be examined, it will be observed that it contains nothing in any way suggestive of a position outside the camp. We have already pointed out that it is not "in harmony with" a theory making Joshua the permanent resident attendant of the Tent[1]: and there is not a syllable in the passage that is decisive of the location of the Tent. That may therefore be left out of consideration.

Turning now to Exodus xxxiii. 7, we read that "Moses used to take *the* Tent [Greek and Syriac, *his* tent] and pitch it for himself [Greek omits "for himself"] without the camp, afar off from the camp; and he called it, The Tent of Meeting." Now in Hebrew this can mean that Moses used to take *a* tent (cp. Deut. xv. 17; and see Strack on this passage, or Driver on 1 Sam. xix. 13). From the latter note the following may be cited: "The garment [i.e. in 1 Sam. xiv. 13, where the Hebrew and R.V. have "the," A.V. "a"], the cord [i.e. in Josh.

resent the people—nothing more: in Numbers they are chosen to assist Moses in dealing with the people, though it is true that their business was not chiefly judicial. (*c*) As to the manna: Numbers xi. 4 ff. is much more vivid and natural if the people had been on the manna diet for a considerable time than if the narrative be placed at the beginning of the wanderings. Moreover, the people have no obvious means of subsistence till after Sinai in this arrangement of the text. (*d*) As to the quails: Attention should be drawn to the dates. We shall discuss these more fully when we consider this chapter of Numbers. For the moment we note the following facts: The first flight of quails occurred on or soon after the fifteenth day of the second month of the first year (Ex. xvi. 1). The second flight must have been at the same season of the year, for the Israelites left Sinai on the twentieth of the second month of the second year (x. 11), and appear to have arrived at Kibroth-hattaavah a few days later. The details of the Mosaic calendar are, of course, unknown to us: but it is reasonably clear that in both narratives the same season is contemplated, and as the Exodus fell in the early spring it is reasonably clear (*pace* Dr. Gray), that "in the original source this story was referred to the spring season." (See, further, Gray, Numbers, pp. 117 f.)

[1] See *supra*, p. 70.

ii. 15, Heb. "the," A.V. and R.V. "a"], the pots [i.e. 2 Kings x. 7, Heb. "the," A.V. and R.V. "in baskets"] are each not determined by some antecedent reference or allusion, but are fixed in the writer's mind, and defined by the article, *by the purpose to which it is, or is to be, put.*" Dr. Driver then cites various examples, including Numbers xxi. 9 "on *a* [Heb. and R.V. "*the*"] pole"; Judges vii. 13 "*a* [Heb. and R.V. "*the*"] tent." Finally, he adds that "a difference between Hebrew and English idiom must here be recognized."

Once this rendering comes into view, it becomes evident that the difference of reading between the Greek and the Hebrew does not cover any important difference of meaning. Whether Moses took *his* tent, or whether he took *a* tent and pitched it *for himself*, does not matter much from the point of view of the sense conveyed. As at present advised we prefer the Hebrew text, but either will serve equally well. Neither in any way suggests the Dwelling, which had not yet been constructed. And on any view of the passage it is extraordinarily improbable that Moses should take the Tent that sheltered the ark and pitch it (without the ark) *for himself*, leaving the ark bared and unguarded, which is the only case the critics can set up on the Hebrew text.

To this Tent those who wished to seek the LORD used to repair: and at this stage it becomes necessary to consider another passage of E, which contains a similar representation, but with important differences. Exodus xviii. narrates certain incidents that happened before Moses left Sinai. It is not at present in its proper position chronologically. We learn (ver. 5) that Jethro came unto Moses into the wilderness, where he was encamped at the mount of God (cp. xix. 2), and Deuteronomy i. 6–19 appears to support this. Mr. Carpenter places it "among the last of the Horeb scenes," and verse 16 would

certainly fit in well enough as a statement made after the Sinaitic covenant. Moreover, Numbers xii. 1 becomes much more intelligible if the Cushite woman had only recently arrived in the camp, as would be the case if Jethro's visit fell shortly before the departure from Horeb,[1] and the language of Deuteronomy i. suits this date. Now it is noticeable that in this narrative, referring apparently to a later time than the events recorded in Exodus xxxiii., Moses does not sit in a tent outside the camp. The differences are striking. In Exodus xxxiii. 7, Moses goes out to the Tent: in Exodus xviii. 13 he sits to judge the people. In Exodus xxxiii. 8 ff. all the people rise and stand at the doors of their tents, looking after Moses. When they see the cloud standing at the door of the tent, they worship. In xviii. 13b, 14, they stand about Moses from the morning unto the evening. It will be observed that both passages alike belong to E, and both narrate the practice whereby

[1] Both Mr. Carpenter and Dr. Gray regard the words "for he had married a Cushite woman" as a gloss. With this view we heartily concur. Our present Pentateuch contains *variorum* notes: and we think that, after the existence of the North Arabian Cush had been completely forgotten, some reader who thought Cushite meant Ethiopian added these words as an explanatory note. It is interesting to note how the narrative gains in vividness when the words are removed. Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 121) writes: "In its present position, it is true, the clause itself, apart from any particular interpretation of Cushite, reasonably implies that the marriage was recent." We would substitute the word "grievance" for "marriage"; and we think that with this alteration the point is well taken. Although the marriage was not recent, Zipporah's presence in the camp and her contact with Miriam and Aaron could then have been of no long duration if she had only arrived shortly before the departure from Sinai. The language used, "the Cushite woman" instead of her name, faithfully reflects the method by which Miriam and Aaron sought to arouse prejudice against her, for union with Midianitish women was perfectly legal in the Mosaic age (Num. xxxi. 18; Deut. xxi. 10–14, etc.) for all Israelites except the high priest (Lev. xxi. 14). Unhappily it has always been only too easy to rouse the feeling of any people against foreigners.

the people consulted the Divine through Moses. It would appear, therefore, that in the interval separating the events recorded the practice had changed. The reason is not far to seek. The sanctuary had been erected, and Moses sat at the door of what had now become the Tent of Meeting, where he could commune with God (Ex. xxv. 22) should need arise (Num. vii. 89; Lev. xxiv. 12; Num. xxvii. 2 and 5 (all P)). Thus the position of Moses when sitting as a judge in E supports and in turn is supported by the statements of P. The tent which figures as the Tent of Meeting in Exodus xxxiii. was disused after the erection of the sanctuary in accordance with the instructions of Exodus xxv., and the very document which tells of the location of this earlier Tent outside the camp plainly shows us that the business which had once been transacted in it was dealt with at a later date in a more central position.

It only remains to consider Numbers xi. and xii., where it is said that the Tent once more stands without the camp. We begin with the latter of these two chapters, as in this way we can use the involuntary assistance of Dr. Gray in destroying the theory he so firmly believes. On verse 5 he writes as follows (p. 124):—

"The LORD descends in the pillar of cloud, and stands at the door of the tent. He then summons Miriam and Aaron, and they both step forward, viz., from the position which they had taken up together with Moses. Certainly this gives the verb ויצאו a sense different from that in which it is used in verse 4, and in itself unusual (yet cp. Zech. v 5). Dillmann explains the verb in both cases of going out from the camp, regarding verse 4 (J) and verse 5 (E) as doublets. But (1) it is not in accordance with E's representation elsewhere that the theophanic cloud should appear, and wait for people to come out from the camp; the persons summoned to or seeking God await His appearance, not He theirs; see Ex. xxxiii 7–11, Num. xi 16 f. 24 f. (2) Verse 4 by its reference to the tent, no less than verse 5 by its reference to the cloud, seems to belong to E."

Dr. Gray's argument that the persons summoned to, or seeking, God await His appearance appears to us unanswerable, and his reference to Zechariah v. 5 is apt. This fixes the sense of the verb in verse 5. But if the word has this meaning in verse 5, it follows of necessity that in verse 4 it need not mean anything more than stepping forward from the encampment of Moses and Aaron east of the Tent (Num. iii. 38) to the Tent itself. It is true that in verse 10 the R.V. translates: "And the cloud moved *from over* the Tent," and this might be thought to conflict with P; but Messrs. Carpenter and Gray are both careful to insist that this meaning is here unsuitable, and Dr. Gray renders "from beside the Tent," citing xvi. 26, 27, and other passages. It must be remembered that the language of Numbers xvi. 42 (Heb. xvii. 7) certainly implies that the cloud did not always actually touch the Tent in P. It was always over it, but the height may have varied. This is also in harmony with Leviticus xvi. 2.

We return now to chapter xi. The case here rests on verses 26, 27, and 30, and turns on two points: (1) the phrase "gone out" in verse 26, and (2) the opposition between the Tent and the camp in all three verses. The first point has already been disposed of, the verb used being the same as in xii. 4, 5. With regard to the antithesis of camp and Tent this reappears in P. In Numbers ii. 17 the R.V. has "the tent of meeting shall set forward, with the camp of the Levites in the midst of the camps." Unfortunately, as Dr. Gray (*ad. loc.*) remarks, this does not translate the Hebrew, which means "the tent of meeting, the camp of the Levites." Dr. Gray speaks of the awkwardness of this, and we think it probable that the true text is preserved by the Greek, which has "and the camp," etc. This only means the addition of the single letter ו to the Hebrew, and gives a far superior reading. But

even if this be incorrect, the antithesis between the Tent and the camps comes out clearly in the latter part of the verse. For these reasons we can see no ground for supposing that chapter xi. locates the Tent elsewhere than in the center of the camp. Professor Green's language may be adopted:—

"It is claimed that in the conception of these passages the Tabernacle was located altogether outside of the camp, contrary to ch ii which places it in the centre of the host. But this is an unwarranted inference from expressions which readily admit a different interpretation, and one in harmony with the uniform representation of all other passages relating to the subject. The camp was a vast hollow square with the Tabernacle in the centre and the tribes arranged about it, leaving of course a respectful distance between the house of God and the tents of men. In approaching the Sanctuary it was necessary to go out from the place occupied by the tents and traverse the open space which intervened between them and the Tabernacle." (Hebraica, vol. viii. p. 183.)

Once this is grasped, it is clear why xii. 5 speaks of God's coming down in the cloud, i.e. the cloud which from the erection of the Dwelling onwards normally stood above the Tabernacle in the center of the camp: and the last shred of justification for the theory that the various sources contain divergent representations of the cloud finally disappears.

We have now disposed of some of the most formidable arguments for the higher critical partition: and this discussion will tend to shorten our treatment of many of the later chapters.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE NARRATIVE EXODUS XIII.–NUMBERS XII.

We return to the crossing of the Red Sea.

Mr. Carpenter raises one or two points of textual criticism which do not fall within the scope of these essays. His other notes on Exodus xiv. really put forward nothing that is worthy of discussion. Thus, on verses 10b, 11 ("and the children of Israel cried out unto the LORD, and they said unto Moses"), he writes: "In J the Israelites expostulate with Moses; with

11 cp xvii 3 Num xiv 3 Ex v 15. According to Josh xxiv 7 they cried to the LORD; this prayer, therefore, is assigned to E." The "therefore" is certainly noticeable as an epitome of higher critical logic, but it would be mere waste of time to discuss such arguments.

Exodus xv. contains the song of Moses. It falls outside the main narrative, and will therefore be passed over here.

Exodus xvi. need not now detain us long. Mr. Carpenter makes two main points: first, that in 6 f. Moses and Aaron announce to the people what is not communicated to Moses till 11 f.; and, secondly, that the story implies the existence of the Dwelling. We have already suggested a transposition which meets the first point, and we have shown the baselessness of the second.[1] Mr. Carpenter further asserts that verses 4 and 11 f. "can hardly be from the same writer." We confess that we fail to see why. He makes a more substantial point when he says that the intention to prove the Israelites in verse 4 fits in with xv. 25b. Certainly chapter xv. has no record of any proof of the Israelites, and it is therefore possible that 25b, 26 have accidentally suffered displacement, and really belong to chapter xvi. In that case they would follow verse 30. And this leads us to speak of one of the quaintest of the higher critical vagaries. It is tolerably obvious that verse 31 (And the children of Israel called the name thereof Manna (Heb. *man*)) is closely connected with verse 15 (they said one to another, What (Heb. *man*) is it), but Mr. Carpenter holds that this portion of verse 15 contains a trace of E, and assigns it to a later priestly editor, while giving its sequel (31) to the main body of P, which of course is earlier than the editor! It may be a question whether verse 31 did not originally stand immediately after "for they wist not what it was" in

[1] *Supra*, p. 90, *note*, pp. 84–86.

verse 15. Indeed that alteration of place could easily be accounted for by a very common MS. error, the copyist's eye having possibly slipped from the "and Moses said" in verse 15 to the same phrase in verse 32, and the omitted passage (15b–30) having then been written in first in the margin and subsequently (on recopying) one verse too soon.

In verse 32 the Septuagint actually reads "of manna" where the Hebrew has "of it": and this involves no change in the consonantal text as originally written, for the *matres lectionis* and the distinct forms for the final letters are of course comparatively recent: and this reading would remove any awkwardness resulting from the removal of verse 31 to the earlier position. It is curious that Mr. Carpenter, while remarking (note on 22) that verse 31 "is not the proper sequel of 30," did not also add that it is the proper sequel of 15a.

Passing to Exodus xvii., we are speedily confronted with some delicious higher critical reasoning. Doublets—by which the higher critics mean two similar narratives—are regarded as proving diversity of source. At present the Pentateuch contains two narratives in which Moses draws water from a rock, Exodus xvii. and Numbers xx. The critics hold it impossible that any author should have told two such stories, and therefore proceed to apply their curious methods. The result is startling. In place of one author who writes two such narratives, we double the number and get two (J and E). "J's traditions," writes Mr. Carpenter (vol. ii. p. 107), "attached parallel incidents to two names, Massah and Meribah. E appears also to have contained explanations of both designations." In addition, P had a Meribah story.[1] So that we reach the result that when the higher critics desire to divide

[1] Perhaps, also a Rephidim story (Num. xxxiii. 14) unless this be based by Ps on the combined Pentateuch.

two by two, their arithmetical labors lead them to believe that the quotient is five![1] Truly a wondrous cure for the Pentateuchal doublets!

It seems unnecessary to follow the details of the reasoning by which the perfectly straightforward narrative of verses 1–7 is reduced to a chaotic collection of unintelligible fragments. All the difficulties that the higher critics experience here are of their own making, and find no support in the undivided text. Mr. Carpenter, however, takes "Horeb," in verse 6, as proving that "the story has been placed too soon .... for Israel has not yet reached the sacred mountain." But this is due to a misunderstanding. Verses 5 and 6 represent Israel as not yet having reached Horeb. On the contrary, Moses is to pass on to Horeb before the people, and God will stand before him there (*not* here). No doubt the water would issue from the rock at Horeb into a channel which would bring it to the people at Rephidim.

Mr. Carpenter holds the fight with Amalek in verses 8–16 to be misplaced. "Joshua enters in 9 without introduction as though he were well known: he is already the tried captain on whom devolves the choice of men for military enterprise. Yet in xxxiii 11 he is formally described, apparently for the first time, and he is then still 'a young man.'" (Vol. ii. p. 107.) "Tried captain" is an imaginative touch, and in the critical scheme the same source that describes him "apparently for the first time" in xxxiii. is permitted to refer to him for a couple of ante-first times in xxiv. 13; xxxii. 17. It is not obvious why Mr. Carpenter should be surprised at a young man's being still a young man after the lapse of a few weeks. If he is astonished at a young man's being intrusted with a high command, he need only think of the ages of the great captains of the world,

[1] Or perhaps six, if P had a Rephidim story.

Alexander, Hannibal, Napoleon, etc. Nor is it clear why Moses—who was eighty when the Exodus took place—should be spoken of as "no longer able himself to sustain his hand outstretched with the rod." Let Mr. Carpenter experiment with a rod, and see whether he finds it easy himself to sustain his hand outstretched with a rod for a number of hours. To speak of the location of Amalek elsewhere near Kadesh as an obstacle is to ignore the whole drift of the narrative. "Then [Heb. and] *came* Amalek," i.e. unnecessarily and gratuitously, to attack the Israelites: and the reference in Deuteronomy xxv. 17 f. certainly appears to confirm the early dating of this episode. There is, therefore, no ground for holding that "the identification of the incident with Rephidim (8) is editorial."

Exodus xviii. calls for no further comment. We have already recognized that it is not in place at present. Mr. Carpenter thinks that "J"'s narrative may have stood before Numbers x. 29 originally, and we think this would be a very suitable place for the whole chapter.

On the other hand, Exodus xxxiii. 7–11 appears to be out of place in its present position. (1) It clearly has no connection with the narrative which at present surrounds it. (2) Exodus xxiv. 14, providing for the interim transaction of judicial business by Aaron and Hur during the absence of Moses and Joshua, appears to refer to some such arrangement as that here described being already in full swing. (3) It would be very suitable to the introduction of Joshua, in which case it must precede Exodus xvii. If it be placed after Exodus xiii. 22, it will be found that all difficulties disappear, and the constant practice of Moses in going outside the camp and speaking to the cloud attaches naturally to the description of the cloud in the preceding verse. Let the notices relating to (*a*) Joshua, (*b*) the seat of judgment, (*c*) the cloud, (*d*) the

judges, (*e*) the Tent of Meeting (including Ex. xxv. 22), be read continuously as suggested, with Exodus xxxiii. 7–11 after xiii. 22 and Exodus xviii. before Numbers x. 29, and it will be seen that the narrative gains in intelligibility.

Chapter xix. is cut up in the usual fashion, but no discrepancies are alleged, save one, which depends on the state of the text. Verse 25 ends abruptly with the words "said unto them," leaving in doubt what Moses did say. Obviously something has here fallen out, and no doubt the missing passage contained the sequel to verse 24 (Moses and Aaron to come up) as well as the speech to the people. The "coming up" cannot have been to the summit, for xx. 19 excludes this: but presumably Moses and Aaron came within the barrier. The rest of the analysis of the chapter is effected by the usual methods. At this stage it is unnecessary to weary our readers with any detailed examination of them.

Nothing of moment is urged against chapter xxiv., and we come to xxxii., where the narrative is resumed.

The first point of importance is raised on verses 25–29. Mr. Carpenter thinks that in 29 "the tribe of Levi is apparently consecrated as the sacred tribe . . . this is altogether different from the programme of P in xxviii." (Vol. ii. p. 131, note on Ex. xxxiii. 25a.) His inference as to the meaning of 29 is, we think, erroneous. It is not suggested in the text that the priesthood was conferred on the tribe as the result of its zeal. If this were the meaning, a ready parallel could be found in Numbers xxv. 10–13 (P); but the difficulty really only arises from a misreading of the passage. The rest of Mr. Carpenter's note clearly betrays the perplexity in which his critical principles have here involved him. But he makes one further remark which should be noted. He thinks that verse 35 refers to some further punishment of the people. It appears to us

that verses 30–34 are out of place, and that verse 35 should follow verse 29. Thus it does not seem to us to refer to any new punishment.

We have already suggested that xxxiii. 7–11 should be removed to an earlier position in the narrative. We would point out that xxxii. 30–34 would follow xxxiii. 6 quite suitably, "bring up this people," in verse 12a, following conveniently on xxxii. 34, but the rest of the chapter contains difficulties that are still unsolved, and indeed appear to indicate textual corruption. Mr. Carpenter writes as follows:—

"The expostulation of Moses in this passage seems directly connected with the command in 1–3. But it may be doubted whether the materials of 12–23 are now arranged in their proper order. The words quoted in 12 'Yet thou hast said' etc. are not uttered till 17: either, therefore, 17 once stood before 12, or, if 17 is in its place, some other divine utterance must have preceded 12. The latter is the view of Bacon who unites 3 with 12 by means of Num xi 10b–15 and a conjectural passage containing the required phrase (it must be remembered that before the union of JE with P Ex xxxiii–xxxiv 28 was followed immediately by Num x 29–xii). Another suggestion is that of Kautzsch who proposes to translate 14 as a question, 'Shall (or must) my presence go with thee, and must I give thee rest?' while Dillmann regards 14–16 as the sequel of xxxiv 6–9, a suggestion which has the support of Driver. The difficulty may be partially met by a simple re-arrangement of the verses; if 17 be transferred as the antecedent of 12, the prayer of Moses 13 'Make me to *know* thy way' is answered by the promise 'My presence shall go with thee.' Of this (16) Moses desires immediate assurance which the LORD grants with the announcement (19) that he will make his goodness pass before him. But Moses, still urgent, prays that the LORD will enable him to *see* his glory, his very self (18). The prayer cannot be satisfied (20), 'Thou canst not *see* my face' (the 'presence' of 15): but in the cleft of the rock he shall behold his back as the LORD passes by 21–23. The more natural order would seem to be 17, 12–16, 19, 18, 20–23 leading directly to xxxiv 6–9." (Vol. ii. p. 133, on 12a.)

But Mr. Carpenter's proposed order is also open to objection, for 17 says, "I will do this thing *also that thou hast spoken*" and must therefore be preceded by some intercession

of Moses which is wanting in the scheme suggested. Moreover, verse 15 f. should apparently come before verse 14. On the whole, it seems best to suppose that the phrases in verse 12 do not refer to anything in our present Pentateuch, but embody an appeal which either has some hidden meaning, or else refers to something of which we have no record.

We conclude this essay by considering the points raised on Numbers xi. 4–34.

We take first the question of the doublets. We have seen that when the higher critics wish to deny the unity of the narrative they rely on duplicate narratives—a feature which they profess to be able to remove. Then they perform their arithmetical operations, and triumphantly produce a larger number of duplicates as the solution of the problem. We witnessed the process in the case of Massah and Meribah, and it may be seen again in the case of the manna. Numbers xi. 4–6 clearly implies that the Israelites had been on the manna diet for a long time and were heartily tired of it. Accordingly it becomes necessary to postulate an earlier reference to manna in JE to make up for the loss of Exodus xvi., most of which has gone to P. If with Mr. Carpenter Exodus xvi. 4 be given to E while the present passage is assigned to J, we shall have at least four manna stories, viz. J two (Num. xi. and its antecedent in the same document) ; E one (Ex. xvi. 4 and its original context) ; P one (Ex. xvi., except verse 4). Moreover, E and P inserted their manna stories at precisely the same point in the narrative, and J's first manna story, being long before Kibroth-hattaavah, must also have come soon after the Exodus. Such are the results of "Critical" analysis!

With regard to the quails the matter is different. It is true that once before the people had had quails, but in Exodus xvi. they play a very subsidiary part, whereas, on this occasion, the

flight lasted a whole month. The dates raise some presumption that there really were two flights of quails. The Exodus occurred in the early spring, and the first flight of quails took place on or about the fifteenth day of the second month. They left Sinai on the twentieth day of the corresponding month of the next year. If, as many think, their year at this time was a lunar year, the solar anniversary of the fifteenth day would fall on the twenty-fifth day of the second month. After the departure on the twentieth day they set forward three days' journey. The season of the year was, therefore, as nearly as possible the same as that of the first flight of quails. The difference in the duration of the two flights may perhaps be due to the altered position of the Israelites or to some temporary circumstances that were peculiar to one or other of the particular years: certainly it explains the surprise of Moses in verses 21 f. If the desert of the wanderings lay near the ordinary route of the quails in their annual northward flight, nothing is more probable than that the Israelites did in fact benefit annually, though after the first two years the incident may not have called for special notice. The annual recurrence of a phenomenon that is well known to happen every year cannot reasonably be regarded as a ground for denying the same authorship to the accounts relating to different years.

From what the critics will not believe we pass to what they will. Mr. Carpenter's note on 10b runs as follows:—

"The expostulation of Moses 10b–12, 15 does not seem in harmony with the cause implied in the context. His 'displeasure' is plainly directed, not like the anger of the LORD against the people, but against the LORD himself. The language of 12 suggests that he repudiates a responsibility which really lies upon the God of Israel. But that responsibility has not here been thrown upon him, except by remote implication. On the other hand it is formally laid on him in Ex xxxiii 1, 12. Now in the original document of JE the Horeb section Ex xxxii–xxxiv immediately preceded the departure in Num x 29 ff, and stood consequently in near proximity to the manna

scene. Bacon accordingly conjectures that this passage once stood after Ex xxxiii 3 and before xxxiii 12. In the combination of J and E these verses were displaced by the insertion of the account of the Tent of Meeting, and were woven into the nearest appropriate situation, where (on this view) they have dislocated the connexion of 13 with 4–10a."

In plain English this means that an imbecile (called a redactor) found certain narratives, chopped them up into sections of unequal length, and subsequently put them together in a different order without regard to their sense. "The insertion of the account of the Tent of Meeting" in a place where it produces endless confusion and the "weaving" of these verses into their present position are among the results of this remarkable procedure. On the whole the theory affords striking illustration of the boundless credulity of the higher critics.

The fact is that these writers have not the slightest understanding of human nature. Consequently they will believe anything except that there is a deal of human nature in man; and it is to be feared that for this reason this chapter must always remain unintelligible to them. But this does not exempt us from the duty of explaining it.

Attention must be given to two points, the feelings of the people and the feelings of Moses. The Israelites had been supported mainly on manna for more than a year. Of course there had been the first flight of quails, and no doubt there were occasional slaughterings of animals belonging to their flocks and herds, but the staple and continuous diet had been manna. That it had grown monotonous and nauseating was an inevitable result, and so far the complaint of the people was entirely reasonable and was probably viewed by Moses with some sympathy. But as frequently happens, a reasonable grievance led to conduct that may more easily be understood

than justified. The people used language that savored of doubt of the Divine power and more than savored of ingratitude and infidelity. As a natural result their complaints produced in their leader a feeling of despondency from which no man could have been exempt in similar circumstances. In his discouragement he felt the task that had been set him too much for his strength and he took the profoundly human course of blaming Him who had laid the burden upon him.

Again in human affairs the proximate or immediate cause of any action frequently differs from and conceals a motive which, though really efficient, appears more remote. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back. This principle finds illustration in the complaint "I am not able to bear all this people alone, because it is too heavy for me." It would probably be wrong to regard these words as the expression of a feeling experienced for the first time on this occasion. Rather should we see in them the final utterance of a sentiment which had grown in strength with each successive incident. "Ye have been rebellious against the LORD from the day that I knew you" (Deut. ix. 24). And the rebelliousness would be felt the more keenly at each successive episode —especially after the great events at Sinai. Hence the complaint and prayer of verses 14 and 15. Hence, too, the appointment of the seventy elders in verses 16 f., 24–30, in direct reply (verse 17 *ad fin.*) to the prayer of 14 f.

It would be impossible to frame a narrative which would be truer to human nature—and therefore less in accordance with the standards of the higher critics—than that contained in these verses.

It need scarcely be said that the critics wrench 16 f., 24b–30, from the context, claiming that a fatuous redactor, finding two utterly unrelated stories, tore them in shreds and then made a

chess-board pattern out of the fragments. Mr. Carpenter, on the ground of the alleged position of the Tent of Meeting, the appearance of Joshua and the "prophetic conceptions," wishes to give these verses to E; but, as Exodus xviii. has already been assigned to that source, he is in a difficulty. Therefore to quote his own expression: "By the side of the secular judges over the 'small matters,' the coadjutor-prophets must be assigned to E^s." It is a pity that Mr. Carpenter did not succeed in carrying his discrimination between a judge and a prophet a little further, and recognize that the relief here sought by Moses has little or nothing to do with the transaction of judicial business. An excellent example of the activity of these elders is to be found in Numbers xvi. 25. It cannot reasonably be claimed that there is anything judicial about the action there attributed to them. They support Moses in a rebellion against his authority. In saying this we do not mean to suggest that these seventy elders did not assist in hearing difficult matters (not easy cases like the captains of thousands, etc.) and transacting public business. But the narrative leaves no doubt that the primary object of their appointment was to give Moses much-needed human support in maintaining his influence and authority over a people who were unfortunately prone to rebellion, and that this object was achieved by conferring on the elders a portion of the Divine spirit, and so rendering them effective and whole-hearted exponents and supporters of the aims and policy of their leader. The relief given was chiefly by means of their sympathy, their coöperation, their family influence, and their general effect on public opinion, and only in a very minor degree by their assistance in the judicial determination of cases.

CHAPTER IV.

Before treating of the critical partition of individual chapters, we propose to clear the ground by grappling with the great catena of difficulties affecting the concluding chapters of Numbers. Here there is some justification for the critics. That is to say, the difficulties are not (like so many that we have considered) purely factitious. There really are problems which can be solved only by textual criticism. While we meet with the characteristics that are unhappily so familiar, it is at least pleasant to think that the sorry performances of the critics are due in part to genuine embarrassment, and not solely to the causes which must elsewhere be held responsible.

At the same time the position is not without its irony. We have found a difficulty in the narrative which has escaped the critics, and we have detected a gloss which has eluded their vigilance. Moreover, we are in the position of having to denounce Drs. Driver and Gray for their artificial harmonistic interpretations. In fact, a very curious thing has happened. In many instances the higher critics can at least claim the merit of having killed an impossible exegesis. In this case they have adopted it. All the supposititious sources are unanimous on one point — that Israel spent the bulk of the forty years in wan-

SKETCH MAP OF THE REGION OF THE FORTY YEARS' WANDERING OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL.

For a powerful presentation of evidence that this whole region had a larger rainfall, and was much more productive, at the time of the Exodus than it is now, see the article on "The Climate of Ancient Palestine" (Bulletin of the American Geographical Society, vol. xl., 1908), by Ellsworth Huntington, whose extensive travels in Central Asia and thorough investigation give exceptional weight to his conclusions. [We are indebted to the kindness of Professor G. Frederick Wright for this note.]

dering, not at Kadesh. The critics are therefore unshakably convinced that the Israelites were at Kadesh the whole time. Indeed, this so delights Wellhausen's heart that he holds that they never went to Sinai at all, but spent that time also at Kadesh. All the sources agree in making the Israelites go to Sinai: and the theophany there is the dominant and central fact of their whole history. All the sources agree in making the Israelites sojourn only a short time at Kadesh, and wander for the bulk of the forty years. What further proof could any higher critic require that the Israelites were never at Sinai or that they spent the best part of the forty years at Kadesh?

As we are to deal with a chain of difficulties that at first sight might appear to be unrelated, we find it impossible to follow our usual procedure of setting out the critical case first and then demolishing it. In this instance we must first prove that the critical and traditional views are alike untenable, and then set up our own case. When we have established that, we can return to the critics and show how at all points it answers their criticism. But, as an introduction to the subject, we may quote from Dr. Gray an account of the critical view of the sojourn in the Wilderness. He is commenting on the words "in the first month" in Numbers xx. 1a:—

". . . . the number of the year has been omitted deliberately. In all probability it was the fortieth; for (1) the event to be related is given as the reason why Moses and Aaron, who had led the people all through their wanderings, are cut off just before the entrance into Canaan (ver. 22–29 xxvii 12–14, Dt. xxxii 48–52 (P), and Dt. xxxiv (so far as it is derived from P)); (2) In chap. xxxiii, which, though not derived from, is dominated by Pg, the wilderness of Zin[1] is the station next before Mount Hor, where

[1] In this and other instances, we have accommodated Dr. Gray's spelling of Hebrew names to ordinary English usage. The lack of common sense which is so characteristic of the critics is very conspicuous in this matter. Thus Dr. Gray writes in his preface: "The

Aaron died in the fifth month of the fortieth year. Thus, according to Pg, Kadesh was merely visited by the people for a short period at the *end* of the wanderings. In JE Kadesh is the scene of a prolonged stay. The people go thither straight from Sinai (cp. xiii 21), and are still there at the end of the period of wanderings (ver. 14). To this source, therefore, and perhaps in particular to J, we may refer *and the people abode in Kadesh;* cp. Jud. xi 17 and also for the vb. (וישב) Nu. xxi 25, 31 (JE). . . . In Dt. chap i f. we find a third view of the place of Kadesh in the wanderings, viz. that Israel 'abode' (וישב) there for an indefinite time (not exceeding a few months) at the *beginning* of the period." (Numbers, pp. 259 f.)

It will be well, before entering more fully into the matter, to consider, first, the nature of the problems that we have to solve; and, secondly, the requisites of a true solution. Apart from minor difficulties, we really have to face four different problems, which at present are inextricably entangled. We have to solve the historical problem, i.e. we must find out what really happened; then we have to deal with two literary problems, i.e. we must discover how the *narrative* in Numbers was shaped and how the *speech* in Deuteronomy was framed; and, lastly, we have to consider how the narrative in Numbers reached its present form. Of these the composition of Deuteronomy gives no serious trouble. The order is largely rhetorical. But it is impossible to be certain about the details of the other three problems when our information is so defective. Thus, if the itinerary in Numbers xxxiii. be considered, it will

ע I have transliterated by S, since Z, when comparison has to be made with the Arabic, is misleading; this necessitates substituting Selophehad, Soan, etc., for the familiar Zelophehad, Zoan, etc." It is probable that not one Bible reader in one hundred thousand desires to make comparisons with the Arabic: it is certain that such comparisons when made by those who are too indolent or too stupid to master the Hebrew alphabet and ascertain the spellings from the original could possess no scientific value. On the other hand, *pace* Dr. Gray and the other apostles of philological pedantry, such transliterations render a book much more difficult to read, and are likely to conduce to its earning a well-merited obscurity.

be found that the sites of the great majority of places named are unknown. We cannot, therefore, be sure of the exact order in which they should come. Again, there are many points that we must leave open because they are not touched by our investigation in any positive and definite manner. For example, we cannot decide whether certain portions of the Pentateuch were originally transmitted orally or in writing. The statements of the book itself as to the writing of certain documents do not necessarily mean that the whole work was originally written, and we shall not find in our present investigation any conclusive reason favoring a theory of either written or oral tradition against the alternative. But, whatever uncertainty may continue to enshroud minor details or matters that in this connection are unimportant, the main outlines of our solution must of course be clear. And this leads us to consider what requirements a solution must fulfil.

All scientific investigation having for its object the ascertainment of truth rests on a single canon, — the coincidences of truth are infinite. In other words, the true hypothesis explains *all* difficulties. Hence our strength lies in the number of perplexities that beset us. A hypothesis that accounted for *one* set of phenomena would possess only a very moderate degree of probability; a hypothesis that accounts for *two* sets would be more than twice as probable, for each set tests and controls any theory that might account for the other set if it stood isolated. And with every additional set of phenomena explained the probability rises progressively. Now in this instance we cannot complain of any lack of tests; for the chapters treating of the period from the arrival at Kadesh-barnea onwards are rich in embarrassments, if in nothing else. The true solution must inevitably satisfy many conditions. In the first instance, it must provide an intelligible account of the

transactions during that period. It must harmonize all the sources. It must fit such geographical data as are reasonably well ascertained. It must remove all chronological impossibilities. It must account for any other difficulties presented by the narrative of the present text. It must solve the literary problem. It must provide an adequate motive for every voluntary human action postulated: it must suggest an adequate explanation of every human error supposed — and when we say adequate we mean such as accords with the ordinary sentiments and habits of mankind, and the known characteristics of the Hebrew race. A hypothesis which satisfied all these tests would have a very reasonable chance of being correct.

In the light of these observations, we turn to examine the narrative of JE as believed by the higher critics.

In Numbers xiv. 25 (JE) we find an express command to leave Kadesh: "To-morrow turn ye, and get you into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea." It is true that the execution of this command was delayed by the disobedience of the Israelites who went up and fought an unsuccessful battle (xiv. 44 f.). This may have consumed a certain amount of time, and may have caused a further delay for tending the wounded, etc.; but, if we are to believe the critics, no notice at all was taken of the command for thirty-eight years. Then the water-supply proved insufficient, and the Israelites—who appear to have borne the pangs of thirst for this period without a murmur—began to complain. Moses—somewhat unreasonably it may be thought—was very angry at the idea that after thirty-eight years the Israelites should wish to drink, and the episode of striking the rock occurred. Next, messengers were sent to the king of Edom requesting permission to pass through his land. The permission was refused, and Moses, in accordance with the command he had

received thirty-eight years previously, set out "by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom." This is the story of the wanderings, according to JE. In the circumstances it is perhaps not surprising that D, who had JE before him, put the events in a different order, and that the higher critics should be able to detect striking discrepancies between Deuteronomy and Numbers.

It will be seen at once, that, quite apart from either the old and well-known difficulties as to the concluding chapters of Numbers or the testimony of Deuteronomy, there are two glaring impossibilities in the narrative we have outlined: First, the story about compassing the land of Edom breaks down utterly. It cannot be that Moses waited thirty-eight years, after receiving the Divine command to turn "to-morrow," without taking any action whatever. Nor is it possible that he should then have sent to the king of Edom for permission to take a route which did not coincide with that commanded by God. Indeed the Divine command to *compass* the land of Edom is obviously subsequent in time to the request for permission to *cross* it, and both the command and the narrative of its fulfilment in xxi. 4b must belong closely together. Nor is the other impossibility less flagrant. It is easily intelligible that the Israelites may have found sufficient water at Kadesh when they arrived and that as the season advanced the water failed; but it is in the highest degree improbable either that the water after sufficing for thirty-eight years suddenly failed or that the Israelites lived without it for that period and then grumbled.

We were so much impressed by this latter point, and by the statement in xx. 1, that "the children of Israel came into the wilderness of Zin," as contrasted with the location of Kadesh in the wilderness of Paran, that we formerly held that

Kadesh-barnea was not identical with the Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin that was called Meribah (Churchman, June, 1906). Further investigation of facts which at first sight appeared to have no obvious bearing on this problem has, however, suggested to us that another explanation may be correct.

We begin by considering the internal evidence of the order of events supplied by JE. We have already laid stress on the impossibility of the message to the king of Edom having originally preceded the command to compass his territory. There is, however, another passage which is clearly misplaced. In Numbers xxi. 1–3 we find narrated a victory over the king of Arad in the Negeb. On this, Dr. Gray writes as follows:—

"The Canaanites of the Negeb (under the king of Arad, a place some 50 or 60 miles almost due N. of Kadesh), hearing of Israel's advance in the direction of their territory take the offensive, fight against Israel, and take some of them captives. Israel vow to the LORD, if granted revenge, to place the Canaanite cities under the ban. Success is granted them, the ban is put into force, and the region or city (? Arad) is consequently called Hormah (Ban).

"It has long been recognised that the section is, in part at least, out of place, and does not refer, as from the position which the compiler has given it it should do, to the period spent at Mt. Hor (xx 22 xxi 4), nor, indeed, to any time immediately before the Israelites took their departure to the E. of Jordan. For why, as Reland pertinently asked, should they abandon the country in the S. of Canaan W. of the Arabah, in which they had just proved themselves victorious? . . . . It is difficult to reach any certain conclusion as to the original position of the section . . . . the story did not, even in JE, stand after xx 21 and before xxi 4; for that passage speaks of the Hebrews taking a *southern* course from Kadesh; the present incident implies that they were moving towards the Negeb, which lies N. of Kadesh." (Numbers, pp. 271 f.)

This section cannot be assigned to any period after the departure from Kadesh to compass the land of Edom, for the Israelites would not have been in the neighborhood. But, if it *precedes* the departure, the reason for the evacuation of the country immediately becomes clear. After this victory the

Israelites sustained a defeat in which they were driven to the very place which they had dedicated, for in xiv. 45 the Hebrew has not Hormah, but *the* Hormah. This order is again confirmed by the fact that xxi. 3 explains the calling of a place by this name, while xiv. 45 assumes that it already has this name. Against this we have to place a sentence in the present form of the itinerary in Numbers xxxiii., which distinctly assigns the Arad campaign to a later period. But we think this verse an obvious gloss inserted by a late reader who had before him the present text of Numbers, and scribbled a note meaning that this was the proper date to which this incident must be assigned.

We print xxi. 1a and xxxiii. 40 side by side:—

NUMBERS XXI. 1a.	NUMBERS XXXIII. 40.
And the Canaanite, the king of Arad, which dwelt in the Negeb, heard tell that Israel came by the way of Atharim; and he fought against Israel, etc.	**And the Canaanite, the king of Arad, which dwelt in the Negeb in the land of Canaan, heard of the coming of the children of Israel.**

It will be observed that xxxiii. 40 looks like a quotation from memory of the earlier verse. It adds nothing to our information,—it stands without any sequel; it leads to nothing, and expresses nothing intelligible. It can only be a note referring back to the narrative beginning with this verse. We therefore think that it is a late gloss, and should be expelled from the text. After forming this opinion, we were confirmed in it by the discovery that the verse is omitted in Lagarde's edition of the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint, being wanting in three out of the four MSS. on which he here relies.

The next step must be to compare Deuteronomy with Numbers; but, in doing so, certain cautions must be borne in mind. An orator does not necessarily adhere exactly to chronology. His aim being to move men's minds, not to produce an exact

record of events, he naturally adopts whatever means may seem to him most suited to his purpose. A historian also may deliberately prefer a topical order to a chronological. The actual order of events might easily differ from the original order of both Deuteronomy and Numbers.

	DEUTERONOMY.		NUMBERS.
i	19a	Leave Horeb	x 11 Departure (second year, second month, twentieth day)
	19b	Arrival at Kadesh-barnea	xx 1a Arrival at Kadesh in the first month of an unspecified year
	22–25	Despatch of the spies to Eshcol and their report	xiii
	26	Rebelliousness of the people	xiii 30 ff
	35f	Sentence on the Israelites except Caleb	xiv 23 ff
	37	Anger with Moses	xx 12
	40	"Turn you, and take your journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea"	xiv 25
	41–44	Expedition by the Israelites: their defeat	xiv 40–43
	45	The Israelites return and weep before the Lord	
	46	"So ye abode in Kadesh many days"	xx 1b "And the people abode in Kadesh"
ii	1	"Then we turned, and took our journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea, as the LORD spake unto me; and we compassed Mount Seir many days"	xx 22a Departure from Kadesh xxi 4b ff by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom, &c
	3	Command to turn north	
	4–8a	Passage through the border of the Edomites	xx 23 "In Mount Hor, by the border of the land of Edom"

DEUTERONOMY.		NUMBERS.	
8b f	Passage through the wilderness of Moab	xxi 11	The wilderness which is before Moab
13 f	Crossing the brook Zered thirty-eight years after the departure from Kadesh-barnea	12	Brook Zered
18 ff	Passing over Ar, the border of Moab		
24	Passing over the valley of Arnon	13	Passing over the Arnon

This table suggests several questions. The first concerns the date of the arrival at Kadesh. Thirty-eight years elapsed from the departure to the time of crossing the brook Zered. It may be supposed that these thirty-eight years were composed as follows: part of the third year, the fourth to the thirty-ninth inclusive, and part of the fortieth year. These may have amounted to thirty-seven years or less according to our modern reckoning, but, according to Hebrew usage, could be spoken of by Moses as thirty-eight years.

Passing from this, it is reasonably clear that originally Deuteronomy and Numbers both told the same story, and that the text of Numbers is deranged. In one instance at any rate—and that not the least puzzling—we get a clue to the reason for the present arrangement. Nobody knows where Mount Hor is, but we learn from Numbers xx. 23; xxxiii. 37 that it is by the border of the land of Edom. From Deuteronomy it appears that at the close of the wilderness period the Israelites did actually pass through the border of the Edomites, but on the *eastern* side. The present position of the narrative of Aaron's death appears to be due to the words "by the border of the land of Edom," which has led the person or persons responsible for the present arrangement of the Numbers narrative to suppose that it referred to the same epoch as the mission to the king of Edom. Thus Deuteronomy

supplies the clue to the order of events, and confirms the inference drawn from the Numbers narrative that the journey to compass Edom *via* the Red Sea was the fulfilment of the command in Numbers xiv. 25, and that it is separated from that command by a short interval of time, due to the rebelliousness of the people, not by thirty-eight years, and it shows that at one time Numbers xx. 22a ("And they journeyed from Kadesh") and xxi. 4b ("by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom") formed a continuous sentence which has been accidentally separated by the interposition of other matters. This will be clearly seen from the following table:—

NUM. XIV. 25b.	NUM. XX. 22a; XXI. 4b.	DEUT. I. 40; II. 1, 14.
To-morrow turn ye, and get you into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea.	And they journeyed from Kadesh by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom.	But as for you, turn you, and take your journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea. . . . Then we turned, and took our journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea, as the LORD spake unto me: and we compassed Mount Seir many days. . . . And the days in which we came from Kadesh-barnea, until we were come over the brook Zered, were thirty and eight years.

It cannot be doubted that in the form of the Numbers narrative known to the Deuteronomist the two half verses in column two formed a continuous sentence, narrating the execution of the command in column one after the disobedience of the Israelites and their subsequent defeat. We see clearly that the command was obeyed in the third year, not in the fortieth, and that the present chronological discrepancy be-

tween Deuteronomy and Numbers on this point is merely due to derangement in the Numbers text. The march round Edom, in both "sources," originally began in the third year; and this is confirmed by Numbers xiv. 33 (P), where נעים "wanderers" should in all apparent likelihood be read for רעים "shepherds." But this is the view of yet another "source." Numbers xxxii. is a bone of contention among the critics. It combines characteristics of JE, D, and P. Mr. Carpenter assigns the bulk of it to P^s, "who may be supposed to have freely worked up earlier materials of J and P" (*ad loc.*). Others regard it as belonging to JE, which of course would be fatal to the theory that in that narrative the Israelites sojourned thirty-eight years at Kadesh. Its statement is unambiguous: "Thus did your fathers, when I sent them from Kadesh-barnea to see the land . . . . and the LORD'S anger was kindled against Israel, and *he made them wander to and fro in the wilderness forty years*" (ver. 8, 13). It is patent that this writer had never heard of the alleged thirty-eight years' sojourn at Kadesh. And even this does not exhaust the Pentateuchal evidence. For reasons which will presently appear, not much reliance can be placed on the present *order* of the places in Numbers xxxiii. (the itinerary), but the names themselves tell a curious tale. The itinerary knows of the compassing by the way of the Red Sea, for Ezion-geber (ver. 35 f.) figures in the list. It also makes the visit to Mount Hor *subsequent* to Ezion-geber. It is true that at present Kadesh separates the two names. But, in a list every item of which is in the form "And they journeyed from x and pitched in y," there are endless opportunities for error through what is called homœoteleuton. A scribe writes the first "and they journeyed" or "pitched," and then looks back to his MS. His eye lights on the second or third or

fourth occurrence of the phrase, and he proceeds to copy what follows, not observing that he has omitted one or more lines. Then, when the MS. is examined, the error is discovered, and noted in the margin,[1] often with the result that, when a fresh transcription is made, the marginal passage is inserted in the wrong place. In this instance the visit to Kadesh after Ezion-geber is contradicted by Deuteronomy, Judges xi. 16 ff., the indications of the JE narrative, and Numbers xxxii. A glance at the map will also show that, geographically, the order is absurd. It is, therefore, obvious that verse 36, "and pitched in the wilderness," etc., to "Kadesh" in verse 37 is misplaced. This may be accidental, or it may be that it was erroneously removed to its present place by somebody who had before him the narrative of Numbers xx. f. in its present order, and introduced his conjectural emendation into the text. These clauses should come either immediately or soon after Hazeroth (ver. 18); but, in our entire ignorance of the whereabouts of most of the places mentioned, their exact position cannot be determined with precision.

The above arguments deal entirely with the substance of the narrative. There is a small point on the form which tends to confirm them. On Deuteronomy i. 46, "And ye abode in Kadesh," Dr. Driver writes: "The phrase refers here to the period immediately following the defeat at Hormah; but in Nu. xx 1 (JE) it is used of the period just before the message sent by Israel to the Edomites, 38 years subsequently." This is very artificial. It will be observed that, by our change, the phrase in question refers to the whole stay of a few months' duration at Kadesh in both Numbers and Deuter-

[1] This appears to have actually happened in verses 30–31 (the visit to Moseroth) in the original text of codex F (the Ambrosian codex) of the Septuagint.

onomy as well as in Judges xi. 17, and is no longer transferred to a different period. A similar discrepancy between "compassed Mount Seir" in Deuteronomy ii. 1 and the use of the expression in Numbers xxi. 4 also disappears.

Before returning to the events preceding the departure from Kadesh, we must examine xx. 22b–xxi. 4a. This passage falls into two sections: (1) the Arad campaign (xxi. 1–3); (2) Mount Hor (xx. 22b–29; xxi. 4a). Now we know from xxxiii. 38 f. that Aaron's death took place in the fortieth year. Both in xx. 23 and xxxiii. 37 we are informed that Mount Hor was by the border of the land of Edom, and we learn from Deuteronomy ii. 4 that the Israelites passed through this border shortly before the close of the thirty-eight years. Accordingly, as already suggested, it must be inferred that Mount Hor was in or near the *southeastern* or *eastern* frontier of Edom, where the Israelites passed near the end of the period of wandering after leaving Ezion-geber, not by Kadesh, which was on the *western* border. It then becomes clear that the original narrative of Numbers probably related how, in compassing the land of Edom, the children of Israel came to Elath and Ezion-geber, and turned thence northwards, passing through the border of Edom. The narrative then continued with Numbers xx. 22b–29; xxi. 4a, and from Mount Hor it brought the Israelites to the station before Oboth (xxi. 10). The MS., having sustained damage involving the loss of a few verses, was arranged on what appeared to be the true clue afforded by "the border of the land of Edom" in xx. 23, which seemed to point to this as referring to the period when the Israelites were near Kadesh on the Edomite frontier. Unfortunately the various events occurred at different times, and on different sides of Edom; so that this arrangement of the narrative was ruinous to the sense.

Nothing similar can be suggested of xxi. 1–3, dealing with the Arad campaign. This passage appears to owe its present position to pure accident. As already stated, Arad lay north of Kadesh, not south, and there is obvious displacement. The arrangement is here fortuitous, as when a leaf drops out of a book and is inserted in a wrong place. We have no means of judging at what period these verses were inserted between xx. 29 and xxi. 4a. As already pointed out, they must originally have stood somewhere before the use of the name Hormah in xiv. 45. The defeat there narrated explains the evacuation of the country in which the Israelites had been victorious.

But then how did xiii. f. come to occupy their present position? We have already seen reason to believe that "the border of the land of Edom" in xx. 23 led to an erroneous location of the narrative of Aaron's death: we believe that a similar clue is responsible for the order of the earlier chapters. Numbers xii. 16 brings the people to the wilderness of Paran. Numbers xiii. 3 tells of the departure of the spies from that wilderness. What more natural than that some editor, searching for the correct order of the narratives, concluded that this should immediately follow the arrival in Paran? As already stated, there are fatal objections to the existing order in the Hormah narrative and the message to Edom. Moreover, there are chronological indications. From xiii. 20 we learn that the mission of the spies took place at the time of the first ripe grapes, i.e. apparently about July. But the arrival at Kadesh occurred in the first month, i. e. about the early spring. The Arad campaign and the negotiations with Edom would fit into this interval very suitably. The other narratives in the chapters affected seem to be for the most part in their right order. The words of Dathan and

Abiram in Numbers xvi. 14 are extremely forcible if they follow a defeat which once for all put an end to all hopes of invasion through the Negeb, and Numbers xx. 3 appears to refer to the ending of that rebellion. Moreover the position of the rod in xx. 8 f. points back to xvii. as being earlier in order of time. On the other hand, there are no clues as to the relative order of the negotiations with Edom and the Arad campaign. Subject to this caution and the need for remembering that the narrative may not have been chronological, we suggest the following arrangement: Numbers xii.; xx. 1, 14–21; xxi. 1–3; xiii.; xiv.; xvi.–xviii.; xx. 2–13, 22a; xxi. 4b–9, then some missing verses, bringing the Israelites to the head of the gulf of Akabah and narrating the turn northwards from Elath and Ezion-geber, then xx. 22b–29; xxi. 4a, and some lost words telling of the arrival at the station before Oboth. We have omitted xv. and xix. from this scheme, because there are no *indicia* of their position, and they do not affect the course of the narrative. Numbers xv. 32 might refer to any one of several years. In Numbers xxxiii. we have seen reason to suppose that verse 40 is a late gloss, and that 36b–37a should come several verses earlier. It may be added that we shall hereafter find cause to adopt an ancient variant that has been preserved by the Syriac in verse 38, — "first" for "fifth" in the number of the month.

And now how far do these suggestions comply with the tests that we laid down when entering on our inquiry into these chapters? Do they give us a probable, consistent, and intelligible narrative? Do they harmonize all the available information? Do they remove all the geographical and chronological difficulties? Do they postulate any unaccountable human acts or omissions?

The narrative that emerges from the rearranged text is in harmony with all the Hebrew sources. There are now no discrepancies on the various points of the narrative between Deuteronomy and Numbers or between different chapters of Numbers. But is the story itself probable, self-consistent, and clear? That question is best answered by summarizing it.

After leaving Sinai, the Israelites proceeded by leisurely stages to Kadesh-barnea. We have no information as to the reason for their consuming many months on the journey, but it may have been partly for purposes of discipline and organization. In the early spring of the third year they reached Kadesh-barnea, south of the Negeb. The place has been identified by Rowlands and Trumbull with Ayn Qadees, and this identification is now generally accepted. From this base of operations they could pursue either of two lines of invasion. They could traverse the land of Edom laterally, and operate from the east, or they could invade the Negeb by marching due north from their base. The first alternative required the consent of the Edomites. This was sought and refused. The second alternative was then attempted. Either before or during or after the negotiations with Edom, a campaign was actually waged in the Negeb, resulting in the defeat of the king of Arad, and spies were sent out to explore the country. But, on hearing their report, the people lost heart, and it became clear that success could not be expected until a new generation had grown up. The order was therefore given to evacuate Kadesh and compass the land of Edom. But the people suddenly veered round and refused to obey. In defiance of the Divine command they embarked on a campaign of conquest. The result was disastrous. They were utterly routed and chased to Hormah, the scene of their former triumph.

It is perhaps to this that the famous Israel stele erected by

Merenptah, who is usually thought to have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, relates. The material portions run as follows in the translation given by Dr. Driver on page 63 of D. G. Hogarth's "Authority and Archæology":—

"Vanquished are the Tehennu (Libyans); the Khita (Hittites) are pacified; Pa-Kan'ana (Canaan) is prisoner in every evil; Askalni (Ashkelon) is carried away; Gezer is taken; Yenoam is annihilated; Ysiraal is desolated, its seed (*or* fruit) is not; Charu has become as widows for Egypt."

Of these, Charu means a people in the south or southeast of Palestine, but the identifications of Yenoam vary. Gezer lies between Joppa and Jerusalem, and Ashkelon is of course also in the south. Hence the "seed" might well refer to crops in the Arad district, or (less probably) to the Kadesh district, of which Trumbull writes as follows:—

"It has a mountain-encircled plain of sufficient extent for the encampment of such an army as Kedor-la'omer's or such a host as Israel's. That plain is arable, capable of an extensive grain or grazing supply, and with adjoining wells of the best water." (H. Clay Trumbull, Kadesh-barnea, pp. 311 f.; see also pp. 269 f., 272 f.)

It should be added that the inscription may be based on reports from Palestine, and does not necessarily describe a conflict between Israel and an army from Egypt. It may merely refer to a victory won by natives who were vassals or subject allies of Pharaoh.

Whether or not this be correct, the defeat at Hormah must have put an end once for all to the hopes of invading Canaan successfully from the south, and may have entailed casualties that involved delaying the departure from Kadesh. It appears to have had immediate results within the Israelitish camp, for dissatisfaction at the failure to conquer Canaan seems to have been partly responsible for the conduct of Dathan and Abiram: "Moreover thou hast not brought us into a land flowing with milk and honey nor given us inheritance of

fields and vineyards." Then came the failure of the water and the incident of striking the rock. We have seen that the arrival at Kadesh took place in the first month, i. e. in the early spring. Trumbull visited Kadesh at the end of March (Kadesh-barnea, p. 263). He gives a very enthusiastic description of the place. Mr. Holland, who was there on May 16, 1878, also speaks well of the water-supply (Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly, Jan. 1884, p. 9). The date of Mr. Rowlands's visit is unfortunately not given.[1] It is, however, quite easy to understand that, as the season advanced, the water-supply became inadequate for the unusually extensive demands of the Israelitish tribes, and that this led to the incident recorded in chapter xx.

At the end of a stay that lasted some months in all, the Israelites left Kadesh by the way to the Red Sea, and never returned to it during the period of the wanderings. Then followed the long weary circling of the land of Edom, and at the end of this period, on the journey northwards from Ezion-geber, Aaron died at some point near the eastern or southeastern frontier of Edom in the fortieth year.

Such in outline is the narrative that emerges from our rearrangement of the text. It is intelligible and self-consistent. How enormous are the difficulties it removes has already been made clear in part, and will appear more fully when we quote some of the other critical objections to the existing text. It remains only to deal with the chronological difficulty.

Aaron died in the fortieth year, according to the accepted text, on the first day of the fifth month (Num. xxxiii. 38). The Syriac has, however, preserved an ancient variant, according to which the event took place on the first day of the first

[1] Dr. Gray has also a reference to an account of the place in the Biblical World for May, 1901, pp. 326–338. It describes a visit on April 13, 1900, and speaks of the water-supply as perennial.

month. The better to examine this we set out Colenso's attack on the chronology.

"(i) We are told that Aaron died on 'the *first* day of the *fifth* month' of the fortieth year of the wanderings, N. xxxiiii. 38 and they mourned for him a *month*, N. xx. 29.

"(ii) After this, 'king Arad the Canaanite fought against Israel, and took some of them prisoners;' whereupon the Israelites attacked these Canaanites, and 'utterly destroyed them and their cities,' N. xxi. 1–3, — for which two transactions we may allow another *month*.

"(iii) Then they 'journeyed from Mount Hor, by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom,' N. xxi. 4, and the people murmured, and were plagued with fiery serpents, and Moses set up the serpent of brass, N. xxi. 5–9, — for all which we must allow, at least, a *fortnight*.

"(iv) They now marched, and made *nine* encampments, N. xxi. 10–20, for which we cannot well allow less than a *month*.

"'We believe that, at every station, at least three days' rest must have been required.' Kurtz, iii. p. 251.

"(v) Then they sent messengers to Sihon, who 'gathered all his people together, and fought against Israel,' and 'Israel smote him with the edge of the sword,' and 'possessed his land from Arnon unto Jabbok,' and 'took all these cities, and dwelt in all the cities of the Amorites, in Heshbon and in all the daughters thereof,' N. xxi. 21–25, — for which we may allow another *month*.

"(vi) After that 'Moses sent to spy out Jaazer, and they took the villages thereof, and drove out the Amorites that were there,' N. xxi. 32, — say, in another *fortnight*.

"(vii) Then they 'turned up by the way of Bashan, and Og, the king of Bashan went out against them, and they smote him, and his sons, and *all his people, until there was none left him alive*, and they possessed his land,' N. xxi. 33–35. For all this work of capturing "three-score cities, fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, besides unwalled towns, a great many,' D. iii. 4, 5, we must allow, at the very least, a *month*.

"Thus, then, from the '*first day of the fifth month*,' on which Aaron died, to the completion of the conquest of Og, king of Bashan, we cannot reckon less altogether than *six months*, (and, indeed, even then the events will have been crowded one upon another in a most astonishing, and really impossible, manner,) and are thus brought down to the *first day of the eleventh month*, the very day on which Moses is stated to have addressed the people in the plains of Moab, D. i. 3.

"And now what room is there for the other events which are re-

corded in the book of Numbers, as having occurred between the conquest of Bashan and the address of Moses? The chief of these were:—

"(1) The march forward to the plains of Moab, N. xxii. 1;

"(2) Balak's sending twice to Balaam, his journey, and prophesyings, xxii. 2–xxiv.;

"(3) Israel's 'abiding' in Shittim, and committing whoredom with the daughters of Moab, xxv. 1–3;

"(4) The death of 24,000 by the plague, xxv. 9;

"(5) The second numbering of the people, xxvi.;

"(6) The war upon Midian, above considered, during which they 'burnt all their cities, and all their goodly castles,' &c., and surely must have required a month, or six weeks for such a transaction." (The Pentateuch, etc., Part i. 2d ed., pp. 144–146.)

It will be seen that our rearrangement of the text has eliminated (ii) and (iii), thus saving six weeks on Colenso's timetable. Moreover, certain other criticisms must be made. According to Deuteronomy ii. 26, Moses sent messengers to Sihon from the wilderness of Kedemoth. This appears to be identical with the wilderness of Numbers xxi. 11 ff., so that Colenso has treated as consecutive events that were really contemporaneous. (See Gray, Numbers, p. 295.) The month for the nine encampments is perhaps excessive; but as, on our view of the true order, there were probably more than nine encampments, no substantial reduction could be effected there. But it is to be noted that the campaigns against Sihon and Og were both decided by single battles, and may perhaps have occupied less time than Colenso allows, and some of the other events may have been synchronous. It is therefore perhaps not quite impossible that the established reading is correct, but the Syriac certainly seems preferable. Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. xlv) attacks the chronology; and, as he imports a new difficulty into the text, perhaps his remarks should be transcribed.

". . . . Between the *departure* from Mt. Hor and the delivery of Moses' final address to the people there elapsed *not more* than five months (cp. xxi 4 xxxiii 38 xx 29, Dt. i 3). Into these few months

there is now compressed the journey south to the Gulf of Akabah, thence north to the Arnon, the despatch of messengers to the Amorites, war with the Amorites and occupation of the country between Arnon and Jabbok, the attempt of Balak to get Balaam to curse Israel (this alone, if Balaam came from Pethor, extending over at the least three months), the intercourse of the Israelites with the Moabite women, the taking of the second census, the appointment of Joshua, the war with Midian, and the subsequent seven days of purification for the warriors; and in addition to the foregoing, the communication of many laws."

Pethor, it must be explained, is identified by Dr. Gray, with the Assyrian Pitru; but, as he himself admits, this identification is philologically unsound (p. 325). We have elsewhere shown (Churchman,[1] February, 1908, pp. 90–92) that Aram-naharaim is identified by the Bible with the Damascus region. The true criterion of the distance is afforded by Genesis xxxi. 23, from which it appears that it was seven days' journey: though of course it does not follow that Balak's messengers consumed seven days on the journey. We therefore are not prepared to go the length of saying that on our present knowledge the Hebrew date is impossible: but we think the Syriac overwhelmingly more probable.

We now set out the remaining difficulties that disappear on our view:—

"It is probable that P related neither the petition to Edom, nor its rejection; and that, on the other hand, in entire disagreement from the foregoing story, he represented the Israelites as actually crossing the *northern* end of Edom in their passage from Kadesh on the W. to the E. of the Arabah." (Gray, Numbers, p. 264.)

". . . . But however this may be, the main point is certain: Iyye-Abarim lay E. of the Jordan valley (including the Arabah); and thus the narrative of Pg, in so far as it is extant, mentions between Mt. Hor (xx 22 xxi 4a) on the W., and Iyye-Abarim on the E., of the Arabah only one place, Oboth (the site of which is unknown), and gives no indication whatever that the passage from W. to E. was made by a long detour southwards from Kadesh by the head of the Red Sea. The fuller itinerary of chap. xxxiii,

[1] The London paper of that name.

which, though the work of Ps, is in the main governed by Pg's point of view, mentions, indeed, a larger number of intervening stations; but it also gives no indication of a detour south. It is therefore highly probable that Pg represented the people marching, unmolested and with ease, straight across the northern end of Edom. Just as forty years before the spies passed through the whole length of Canaan at will, so now the Israelites approach Canaan by the direct and chosen route with entire disregard of the people then in possession of the country." (*Op. cit.*, p. 282.)

". . . . Thus, like Pg, the itinerary recognizes no *southern* movement from Kadesh." (*Op. cit.*, p. 443.)

"A second and more significant instance occurs in Num. xx. The Israelites arrive at Kadesh in the first month (ver. 1), apparently of the third year, reckoning from the Exodus, the last previous date marking the departure from Sinai, in the second month of the second year (x 11). In xx 22 the march is resumed, and in consequence of the refusal of Edom to allow a passage through its territory, a long circuit is necessary. The first stage brings them to Mount Hor, where Aaron dies upon the summit. In the list of the encampments in xxxiii 37 this incident is fixed in the fortieth year of the wanderings. Between xx 1 and 22 ff there is thus an interval of at least thirty-seven years (cp Dt ii 14, from Kadesh to the brook Zered thirty-eight years). Is it credible that the 'journals' of Moses found nothing worthy of record in this long period beyond a solitary instance of popular discontent, and a fruitless embassy to the king of Edom? Did an entire generation pass away, without any further trace than the bones of its 'fighting men' upon the wilderness? Only at a later day could imaginative tradition have rounded off the whole into a fixed form of forty years, and been content to leave the greater part a blank." (Oxford Hexateuch vol. i. p. 28.)

"[Dt.] i 37–38. In Nu. xx 12 (cf. xxvii 13 f. Dt. xxxii 50 f.) Moses is prohibited to enter Canaan on account of his presumption in striking the rock at Kadesh in the 39th year of the Exodus: here the ground of the prohibition is the LORD'S anger with him *on account of the people*[1] (so iii 26 iv 21), upon an occasion which is plainly fixed by the context for the 2nd year of the Exodus, 37 years previously. The supposition that Moses, *speaking in the 40th year*, should have passed, in verse 37, from the 2nd to the 39th year, returning in verse 39 to the 2nd year, is highly improbable." (Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. xxxv f.)

"[Dt.] i 46 ii 1. 14. As shown in the notes on pp. 31–33 it seems impossible to harmonize the representation contained in these pas-

[1] A very little knowledge of human nature would explain the language of Moses in these passages.

sages with that of Numbers; according to Nu. xiv, &c., the 38 years in the wilderness were spent at Kadesh: according to Dt. they were spent *away* from Kadesh (ii 14), in wandering about Edom (ii 1)." (*Op. cit.*, p. xxxvi.)

When to these difficulties are added the incredibility of the view that the water at Kadesh failed in the thirty-eighth year of the sojourn, the impossibility that the message to Edom could have followed the command to compass the land, the further impossibility that the command itself was ignored for thirty-eight years, the geographical veto of the theory that a southward march from Kadesh brought the Israelites to Arad in the North, the difficulty of understanding the evacuation of the conquered territory by the victorious host, the improbability that the explanation of Hormah should have followed the first use of the name with the definite article, the chronological monstrosities and the awkwardness of supposing that such phrases as "abode" are used differently in Deuteronomy and Numbers, some idea will be formed of the nature of the problem. And if it be asked what changes we effect in the Hebrew text in order to provide the solution, the answer is that in one instance we have expelled a gloss and in another we have altered a single word — in each case with the support of an ancient Version. Apart from this, we have only effected transpositions that were necessitated not merely by internal evidence, but also by the convergent testimony of Deuteronomy. Last, but not least, we have postulated no improbable human act or omission, but have merely suggested that ancient documents have been subjected to the ordinary vicissitudes of MS. tradition.

THE MISSION OF THE SPIES.

Dr. Gray's summary of the difficulties will in this instance be given because, while containing everything material, it is much shorter than Mr. Carpenter's:—

"Nothing but the baldest analysis of the story as it now lies before us is possible without recognising the numerous incongruities in detail by which it is marked; some of these might be harmonised, others are hopelessly irreconcilable. The point of departure of the spies is now the wilderness of Paran, ver. 3. 26a, now Kadesh, ver. 26b; the country reconnoitered is now the whole land of Canaan, ver. 2. 17a, from the extreme south to the extreme north, ver. 21, now only the southern district round Hebron, ver. 22–24; the majority of the spies now report that the land is unfertile, ver. 32, now that it is very fertile, but invincible, ver. 27–31. 33; now Caleb alone dissents from the majority, ver. 30, and is alone exempted from punishment, xiv 24; now both Joshua and Caleb dissent, xiv 6 f, and are exempted, xiv 38. Even when the details of the narrative are not incongruous, they are frequently duplicated, or the style is markedly redundant (*e.g.* xiii 17–20, and note the extent to which xiv 11–24 and ver. 26–35 are parallel in substance.") (Numbers, p. 129.)

The first of these discrepancies is purely factitious. The statement in the text is, "And they went, and came to Moses, and to Aaron, and to all the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh" (Num. xiii. 26), and the discrepancy can be manufactured only by tearing this verse asunder, and giving "to Kadesh" (with what follows) to JE, while assigning the earlier portion of the verse to P. That Kadesh was the only point of departure recognized by any "source" is proved by the fact that in Numbers xxxii., where a late priestly writer refers to the incident, he speaks of Kadesh-barnea as the starting-place (ver. 8). The real question is as to the precise relations of Zin and Paran. Two theories have, however, been put forward, either of which would meet the exigencies of this passage: (1) that Zin was a part of Paran, and (2) that Paran is used in a wider and a narrower sense, sometimes including Zin and sometimes being applied more exactly to the desert south of Zin. The data at our disposal are insufficient for any final decision between these two views. It should, however, be noted that the gravamen of the higher critical argument lies in the present position of

Numbers xx. 1, which we have already found reason to regard as misplaced. Thus Dr. Gray writes, "In the fortieth year the people apparently march out of the wilderness of Paran to Kadesh." (Numbers, p. 91.)

The second difficulty is more serious. It is, in fact, the case that Numbers xiii. 21 in the present text represents the spies as going unto Rehob to the entering in of Hamath. Nothing is known of this Rehob: an attempt has been made to identify it with the Rehob of 2 Samuel x. 8; but (1) this was a Syrian town, and (2) its proper name seems to have been Beth-Rehob, the abbreviated form being in a passage where the full name has already been given. On the other hand, it is quite certain that "the entering in of Hamath" is in the north. According to the present text, therefore, verses 21 ff. represent the spies as passing through the extreme north of the land on their way to Hebron. From his own peculiar point of view Dr. Cheyne argues for corruption (Enc. Bib. 402b); and, so far as we can see, there is no logical escape from some such hypothesis on any view. According to the documentary theory, P sends the spies up to the extreme north; but this loses sight of the fact that in Numbers xxxii. a late priestly writer knows nothing of this extensive exploration and fixes on Eshcol as the limit of the expedition (ver. 9). This is the more remarkable as, from other features of that chapter, it is obvious that this writer was acquainted with our present narrative, in what Dr. Gray calls "its present composite form (JE P)." (Numbers, p. 426.) It is reasonably clear, therefore, that this writer knew of nothing in the present narrative that was inconsistent with the Eshcol story. Further, it may be urged that any editor who desired to combine a statement that the spies went to Eshcol with one that they went further north would presumably have placed our present verse 21 *after*, and

not before, the visit to Eshcol, i.e. after 24; for he must have been perfectly familiar with the positions of Hebron and the entering in of Hamath. Hence we may reasonably suppose that the difficulty is due to some error in the MS. tradition. Unfortunately, in the present state of textual criticism, it is impossible to suggest the remedy.

There is extant evidence of variations in the text which point to textual criticism as the means of finding the solution of the next difficulty, viz. the discrepancy in the reports of the spies. In xiii. 30 the Septuagint text of Caleb's speech begins with *οὐχί, ἀλλὰ* — "nay, but," — though there is nothing corresponding to these words in the Hebrew. This beginning is comprehensible only on the supposition that something is missing before verse 30 in its present position, and we have long felt that the words "and Caleb stilled the people" point in the same direction. Whether or not verse 29 is a later note which has crept into the narrative, it seems tolerably clear that the text is not in order. Either something has been lost narrating the lamentations of the people on hearing the first report of the spies, or else some transposition has taken place. In the latter case the difficulty might be met by removing either xiii. 30–32 or more probably xiii. 30–xiv. 1b ("voice") to a position after xiv. 4. Curiously enough Dr. Gray suggests that xiii. 30 should perhaps come here, and Mr. Carpenter has a very similar theory. Had they not been under the influence of the divisive hypothesis, they would probably have reflected that there was here a case for textual criticism which must make it impossible to dogmatize about the contents of the original narrative. Transpositions of this kind appear to point to the piecing together of a MS. that had been considerably torn. With regard to the double report as to the land, it must be noticed that the critical analysis altogether

fails to eliminate this feature. The only difference is that the text which presents two conflicting accounts is now assigned to P instead of to Moses. For Numbers xiii. 32 gives an evil report, and Numbers xiv. 7 makes Canaan "an exceeding good land." If we turn from the condition of the text to the consideration of what actually happened, the outlines appear to be reasonably clear. There was first a favorable report, tempered by remarks on the strength of the inhabitants. That resulted in a panic, under the influence of which the majority of the spies shifted round and abused the land, while Caleb, supported by Joshua, stood to the original facts and urged the people to have courage.

The last supposed discrepancy — that Caleb in one account alone dissents from the majority, and is alone exempted from punishment — is one of those extraordinary arguments which it is difficult to take seriously. Hebrew tradition is absolutely consistent in representing Joshua as having been the leader under whom the Israelites entered Canaan. That being so, it must have conceived him as being alive at the time. But, according to the critical theory, in the JE story Caleb alone of the men of that generation was to live — and that though E is supposed to have a special interest in Joshua. This is but one more instance of the fatal lack of sympathy with the narrator's methods of expression. For the rest it is sufficiently clear that at first Caleb took the lead and overshadowed Joshua.

It may be worth while in this connection to deal with another little higher critical argument. On xiii. 6, "of the tribe of Judah, Caleb," Dr. Gray writes (Numbers, p. 136): "According to another and earlier tradition, Caleb was a Kenizzite, xxxii 12 Jos. xiv 6, 14." Now xxxii. is alleged to be the work of a late priestly writer, so that the reference to this as

embodying an earlier tradition calls for inquiry. On the verse in question Dr. Gray says (p. 430), "In P Caleb is a Judahite." Apparently therefore P^s does not agree with "P." But if we turn to the two passages in Joshua we get an explanation of the phenomenon: "Then the children of Judah drew nigh unto Joshua in Gilgal; and Caleb the son of Jephunneh the Kenizzite said unto him," etc. That is to say, even the "earlier tradition" treats Caleb the Kenizzite as having been so incorporated with the children of Judah as to be for all practical purposes a constituent member of the tribe; and there is no passage in P that in any way conflicts with this. We have no means of telling how or when this incorporation had been effected: but the fact itself is not open to doubt, and its recognition makes it impossible to manufacture any discrepancy between the relevant passages.

With regard to the redundant style and the duplications of detail, this may be due in part to the condition of the text, but in part it is merely another way of saying that, had Dr. Gray been the narrator, he would have told the story differently. This opinion we are not concerned to discuss.

KORAH, DATHAN, AND ABIRAM.

The next chapter that gives trouble is Numbers xvi. But here variants have been preserved by the Septuagint which show very clearly that we have to deal with nothing more serious than some slight textual corruptions which have been made the foundation for one of those extraordinary theories which only higher critics can be expected to believe. We have dealt with these matters at some length elsewhere,[1] and no answer has been put forward to our arguments. We therefore do not propose to treat of this chapter in much detail here.

[1] See Studies in Biblical Law, pp. 35–39.

Dr. Gray (p. 187) appears impressed by the fact that Deuteronomy xi. 6 only mentions Dathan and Abiram; but this is due partly to the purpose of the book, which, being intended for public reading, deals only with that section of the episode which is germane to its purpose, and partly to a fact that will presently emerge. To say, as Dr. Gray does, that Numbers xxvii. 3 refers only to Korah is to misread the fact that the context recognizes non-Levites as having been associated with him. It is true that Dr. Gray arbitrarily cuts out "ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi," in xvi., in order to obtain a revolt of a non-Levitical Korah; but his vivisection of this chapter is due to incompetence to appreciate marks of artistic unity. No true literary critic could possibly overlook or miss the force of the repeated "ye take too much upon you" in verses 3 and 7, and the repeated "Is it a small thing" in verses 9 and 13.

The truth is that verses 24 and 27, and possibly one or two other verses, have suffered in transmission. The Hebrew "Dwelling" is elsewhere in the Pentateuch applied to the Tabernacle or a portion of it, but not (in the singular) to a human habitation, and the phrase "Dwelling of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram" is impossible for other reasons. (See Gray, p. 204.) This has been recognized by the higher critics, who therefore do not keep the Hebrew text. Unhappily they quite characteristically ignore the evidence of the Septuagint which does not help them. But those who are capable of weighing evidence will prefer (when once they admit that the Hebrew text is wrong) to seek a reading that has some MS. authority, rather than to embark on biased speculations. In verse 24 the Septuagint has "the company" for "the Dwelling," and two of the best codices omit "Dathan and Abiram." This gives us "speak unto the congregation, saying, Get you

up from about the company of Korah. And Moses rose up and went unto Dathan and Abiram." In verse 27 the same two MSS. again omit "Dathan and Abiram," and the Ambrosian has "Korah's company." This half verse should follow 24 immediately. Then we have: "So they gat them up from the company of Korah on every side" as the sequel of our amended 24, and the rest of the chapter is really quite smooth so far as the higher critical difficulties are concerned. But if the text of Numbers xxvi. 10 is sound, one difficulty remains. Korah is there said to have been swallowed up with Dathan and Abiram. This time, however, the Samaritan comes to the rescue with the following text: "And the earth opened her mouth and the earth swallowed them up when the company died, what time the fire consumed Korah and two hundred and fifty men." Whether the phrase "the earth" is original in the second place where it occurs may be doubted; but the statement that the fire devoured not merely the two hundred and fifty, but also Korah, removes all the difficulties. Dathan and Abiram with their families and tents, and Korah's human and other chattels were swallowed by the earthquake which destroyed portions of the camp, but Korah himself was near the Tabernacle with the two hundred and fifty and was consumed by fire from heaven. It will be noticed that the difference between the Hebrew and the Samaritan, if once the second "the earth" be expelled from the latter, is very slight. The latter has in its favor the fact that it might more easily have given rise to the corruption than the former. In a text presenting אתקרחואת the copyist's eye could easily slip from the first את to the second. The omitted phrase being inserted in the margin perhaps in the form ואתקרח would be likely to lose its proper position. This gives an additional reason for the non-mention of Korah in Deuteronomy and the

non-mention of Dathan and Abiram in Numbers xxvii., since they were not involved in a common fate. It will therefore be seen that the correction of the text in the light of the ancient evidence removes all difficulties, and involves none of the absurdities that are inevitable in a scheme which postulates a fatuous redactor who composed an aimless and unintelligible mosaic out of two unrelated stories.

THE BALAAM NARRATIVE.

The attitude of the critics to the Balaam narrative is somewhat strange, for Dr. Gray first enumerates four points that in his opinion evidence compilation, and then practically shows that he does not take the first three at all seriously (Numbers, p. 309). Two of the three are certainly trifling. The third is made by insisting that Balaam's home in Numbers xxii. 5 is by the Euphrates, and then altering "the land of the children of his people" to "the land of the children of Ammon," with some MSS., the Samaritan and some of the Versions. This gives an inconsistency between the land of Ammon and Pitru on the Euphrates: but as Balaam really came from Pethor (not Pitru) in Aram-naharaim (not Mesopotamia),[1] on a river which was not the Euphrates, from the land of "the children of his people" (not "of Ammon"), it will be admitted that there is some ground for Dr. Gray's distrust of the point. It is of course quite possible that "the children of his people" is really a corrupt phrase under which the true reading lies concealed; but "Ammon" is a little too easy and obvious to be probable.

The real difficulty in Dr. Gray's words

"consists mainly in the fact that *in ver. 20f, Balaam, having received God's permission to go, is on his way accompanied by the*

[1] See *supra*, p. 136.

princes of Balak, whereas *in ver. 22 Balaam is on his way accompanied by two servants and without having received the* LORD'S *permission:* for that is the obvious meaning of the LORD'S anger" (Numbers, p. 309).

We admit that there is a difficulty, but in the absence of any clue from the Versions we could only hazard guesses as to the true solution; and this we are unwilling to do for fear of obscuring the really strong points of our case.

THE OTHER ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES IN NARRATIVE BETWEEN DEUTERONOMY AND EXODUS–NUMBERS.

On pages xxxv to xxxvii of his "Deuteronomy," Dr. Driver deals with these, which he sets out in nine numbered sections. Two of the discrepancies depend on the genuineness of Deuteronomy x. 6 f. Dr. Driver himself does not believe these verses to be an integral part of the book, nor do we. The order of the stations does not agree with the itinerary in Numbers xxxiii., the death of Aaron is here said to have taken place at Moserah, and these verses make the chronology of the separation of Levi (x. 8 f.) extremely difficult. It is true that the phrase "at that time" is not to be pressed too far: yet in this context it would have to be stretched out of recognition to harmonize with Numbers. It is of course possible that Moserah was at or near Mount Hor: and the stations in Numbers xxxiii. may have experienced considerable derangement in transmission. Nevertheless our present knowledge is not such as to justify us in preferring the data of a fragmentary note of this description which is admittedly out of place to even the present order of the stations in Numbers xxxiii. As a pure question of textual criticism, the reasons stated by Dr. Driver (p. 118) are in our judgment conclusive against the present position of the fragment, and, that being so, he is undoubtedly right in refusing to use the difficulties it presents

to support an argument in favor of the documentary theory.

The other difficulties are arranged by Dr. Driver in three groups. The first consists of two points which he himself does not take seriously. These we need not stay to discuss. The second comprises two inconsistencies, which "awaken graver doubts." The remaining three perplexities "cannot be fairly explained upon the hypothesis of Mosaic authorship." But of these three, two — the date of the smiting of the rock at Meriboth-Kadesh and the discrepancy as to the alleged thirty-eight years' sojourn at Kadesh — have already been solved by our rearrangement of the text of Numbers. Hence we have only three cases left to consider, of which one only is, in Dr. Driver's opinion, incompatible with Mosaic authorship. We take these three difficulties in the order adopted by Dr. Driver (following the text of Deuteronomy). This leaves the most serious to the last.

The first is stated as follows:—

> "[Dt.] ix 9. According to Ex. xxxii–xxxiv Moses was three times in the mount (xxxii 1ff.; xxxii 31; xxxiv 4); but it is only on the third occasion that he is recorded to have fasted (xxxiv 28): Dt., in the very words of Ex., describes him as doing so on the *first* occasion. Obviously, Dt. may relate what is passed by in silence in Ex.; but the variation is remarkable." (Deuteronomy, p. xxxvi.)

Clearly the first thing is to consider whether or not we are to believe that Moses fasted on the occasion of his first visit to the Mount. We do not suppose it will be seriously suggested that any canonical writer or source believed that he partook of food during the time that he was communing with God. If that be so, we are face to face with a simple argument from silence — never a very formidable weapon — and not with any difference of tradition. But if we further look at Exodus to see how the narrative is constructed, we find that the visit to the Mount came to an abrupt end owing to the episode of the

golden calf. At the point where, but for that episode, we might have had a calm statement of the conclusion of the visit, the relation of the sin of the people is followed by a command to leave the Mount. The insertion of a statement that Moses fasted would have been utterly out of place in that narrative. Points like this are not perhaps very easy to demonstrate, but we would ask anybody who feels doubts on the subject to read the narrative of Exodus xxxii. and consider what would be the effect of interposing a statement that Moses fasted, at any point he may choose for the experiment. He will find that course more convincing than pages of argument.

The next argument is as follows:—

"[Dt.] ix 25–29. This, it is plain, must refer either to Ex. xxxii 31f. (Moses' *second* visit to the mountain), or (more probably) to Ex. xxxiv 9. 28 (his *third* visit to it). It is singular, now, that the terms of *Moses' own intercession*, as here reproduced, are borrowed, not from either of these passages, but from xxxii 11–13, at the close of his *first* forty days upon the mountain." (Deuteronomy, p. xxxvi.)

We are here rather embarrassed by the number of available replies. First, we have seen so many instances of displacement that it would put no great strain on our credulity to suppose that verses 26–29 ought to stand after verse 14. It is true that in the Revised Version verse 15 reads "*so* I turned," but the Hebrew is "*and* I turned," and does not necessarily convey the same idea as the English. It is possible that this transposition is correct: but we are bound to say that we do not think it at all necessary. Two reasons weigh with us. First, we can see no improbability in supposing that an old man speaking of events that had taken place nearly forty years before might inadvertently misplace them even if he desired to adhere to chronology. We do not picture Moses as a sort of modern professor carefully looking up his references

and endeavoring to copy his sources with scrupulous accuracy. And the second is, that the context proves beyond a peradventure that chronology in the present passage is deliberately sacrificed to rhetorical effect. We cannot illustrate this better, than by setting out in tabular form the arrangement of the narrative, on the view that Dr. Driver regards as more probable.

Deut. ix	15–16	Moses descends from the mountain after his first visit and sees that a calf has been made.
	17	He breaks the tables.
	18–20	*Third* visit to the mountain.
	21	Destruction of the golden calf.
	22	Reference to Taberah, Massah, and Kibroth-hattaavah.
	23	The rebellion at Kadesh-barnea.
	24	"Ye have been rebellious from the day that I knew you."
	25	Resumption of the narrative of the third visit.
	26–29	Terms of the prayer uttered during the first visit.
x	1	Command to hew the new tables and come up to the mount for the third visit.
	3	Ascent for the third visit.

It must be admitted that on any view of the authorship of these chapters the chronological theory cannot be sustained. The prayer in ix. 26–29 is not the prayer uttered during the third visit, nor can its position in so thoroughly non-chronological an arrangement of facts be regarded as evidence that in the writer's view it was offered up on this occasion. Is it then possible to assign any reason for the order? We think so. On verse 25 Dr. Driver notes that:—

> "The Writer reverts here to the occasion mentioned verse 18, for the purpose of emphasizing (in accordance with the general design of the retrospect) the indebtedness of Israel to Moses' intercession." (*Op. cit.*, p. 116.)

Now in connection with the episode of the golden calf, this intercession took two forms, fasting and prayer. The former

is mentioned first,— probably because it would be likely to impress the people more. But if the full extent of that intercession was to be made clear it was necessary also to insert a prayer. For reasons which will be readily understood, it was impossible to repeat Exodus xxxii. 31. No man who could utter the words, "and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written," could be expected to repeat them for rhetorical purposes in a speech to the people. The single sentence which contains the only reported prayer uttered by Moses on the third visit is equally unsuited for the speaker's purpose, though for different reasons. It begins with the words, "If now I have found grace in thy sight"— hardly the best way of bringing home to the people the extent of their iniquity — and is directed to the petition that God would go up with them Himself instead of sending an angel. It does not even contemplate the danger which had once been imminent, and which the Deuteronomist here desires to emphasize, viz. that God might utterly destroy them. The point of the whole passage, in so far as it turns on the intercession of Moses, is that, but for his action, God would have destroyed the people: "Let me alone, that I may destroy them, and blot out their name from under heaven" (ver. 14). Hence the first prayer was the only one which it was possible to quote: and the difficulty results, not from the quotation, but from the failure to realize that the arrangement is not meant to be chronological. This failure is the more curious because of Dr. Driver's treatment of verses 18–20.

On the occasion of Moses' first visit to the mount the Israelites made a golden calf. Moses in Exodus destroyed the calf (Ex. xxxii. 20), and subsequently revisited the mount. But in Deuteronomy we are told (ix. 18–20): "I fell down before the LORD as at the first, forty days and forty nights," and it

is only afterwards that Moses narrates (ver. 21) how he destroyed the calf. And Dr. Driver, instead of saying that, as this is in conflict with chronology, it disagrees with Exodus, writes approvingly: "No doubt this intercession is mentioned here, in anticipation of its true chronological position, on account of its significance in the argument." (Deuteronomy, p. 115.)

No doubt it is; but, if chronology may be set aside when it suits the orator in verses 18–20, why must it override all other considerations in verses 26–29?

The last point — which it must be remembered is one of the three that Dr. Driver regards as fatal — is also chronological:—

"[Dt.] x 1–4. This passage agrees — to a large extent verbally — with Ex. xxxiv 1–4, 28, with the difference that in Dt. Moses is directed to make, and actually does make, an ark of acacia-wood *before* ascending the mount the third time, to receive the Ten Commandments. That Moses should describe as made by himself what was in fact made by Bezal'el, acting on his behalf, is, no doubt, natural enough; but in the narrative of Ex. (as it now stands) the command is both given to Bezal'el, and executed by him, *after* Moses' return from the mountain (xxxvi 2 f. xxxvii 1). The discrepancy in two narratives, *so circumstantial as each of these is*, is difficult to explain, if both are the work of one and the same writer, describing incidents in which he was personally concerned." (Deuteronomy, p. xxxvi.)

If such a discrepancy occurred in the work of a modern statesman, nobody who knew anything about the fallibility of human testimony would feel surprised: but the astonishing accuracy of the statements in Deuteronomy lends weight to the objection. It is true that the order is partly rhetorical, not chronological: but it seems clear that the recollection of Moses pointed to the making of the ark as having been put in hand before the ascent. But it happens that there are other

grounds for supposing that there is something wrong with the text of Exodus xxxv.–xl. By way of putting forward the most extreme critical view, the following is quoted from the late Dr. William Robertson Smith:—

"A remarkable case of variations between the Hebrew and the Greek is found, where we should least expect it, within the Pentateuch itself. The translation of the Law is the oldest part of the Septuagint, and in the eyes of the Jews was much the most important. And as a rule the variations are here confined within narrow limits, the text being already better fixed than in the historical books. But there is one considerable section, Exod. xxxv.–xl., where extraordinary variations appear in the Greek, some verses being omitted altogether, while others are transposed and knocked about with a freedom very unlike the usual manner of the translators of the Pentateuch. The details of the variations need not be recounted here; they are fully exhibited in tabular form in Kuenen's *Onderzoek*, 2d ed., vol. i. p. 77, and in Driver's *Introduction*, p. 37 sq. The variations prove either that the text of this section of the Pentateuch was not yet fixed in the third century before Christ, or that the translator did not feel himself bound to treat it with the same reverence as the rest of the Law. But indeed there are strong reasons for suspecting that the Greek version of these chapters is not by the same hand as the rest of the Book of Exodus, various Hebrew words being represented by other Greek equivalents than those used in the earlier chapters. And thus it seems possible that this whole section was lacking in the copy that lay before the first translator of the Law. It is true that the chapters are not very essential, since they simply describe, almost in the same words, the execution of the directions about the tabernacle and its furniture already given in chaps. xxv.–xxxi. Most modern critics hold chaps. xxxv.–xl. for a late addition to the text, and see in the variations between the Hebrew and the Greek proof that the form of the addition underwent changes, and was not finally fixed in all copies when the Septuagint version was made. In favour of this view several considerations may be adduced which it would carry us too far to consider here. But in any case those who hold that the whole Pentateuch dates from the time of Moses, and that the Septuagint translators had to deal with a text that had been fixed and sacred for a thousand years, have a hard nut to crack in the wholly exceptional freedom with which the Greek version treats this part of the sacrosanct Torah." (Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 2d ed., pp. 124 f.)

Dr. Smith quite characteristically forgets that the Samaritan Pentateuch which, according to his view on page 61 of

this same work, dates from about 430 B. C., here supports the Hebrew, and proves that the chapters in question are at least considerably older than the Septuagint:[1] but the variations undoubtedly call for some explanation. Unfortunately the available data are quite inadequate for the purpose. They certainly point to editorial arrangements of these chapters, perhaps to expansions. We shall have to glance at some further evidence of the state of the text, when we deal with the numbers.[2]

For the present we can only say that in our judgment no variation they may exhibit from the statements of Deuteronomy can be held to tell against the latter book until more is known of the method in which the existing text was formed. Rather we should hold that the Deuteronomic account supplies additional evidence of editorial activity in the chapters in question.

[1] Similarly he writes (p. 375): "It is disputed whether, in Exod. xxx. 16, 'the service of the tabernacle,' defrayed by the fixed tribute of half a shekel, refers to the continual sacrifices. If it does so, this law was still unknown to Nehemiah, and must be a late addition to the Pentateuch." The "late addition" is found in the Samaritan, which therefore proves that the law is not subsequent to Nehemiah.

[2] See *infra*, pp. 163–164.

CHAPTER V.

THE NUMBERS OF THE ISRAELITES.

We now have to consider matters which have caused grave embarrassment to successive generations of interpreters. Dr. Gray's statement is as follows:—

"It will be convenient to gather together here and to consider once for all the numbers yielded by the two censuses recorded in Numbers (chaps. i–iv, xxvi). The details given are the numbers (1) of male Israelites over twenty years belonging to each of the twelve secular tribes: (*a*) in the second year of the Exodus, chap. i f.; (*b*) in the fortieth year, chap. xxvi; (2) of firstborn male Israelites above a month old, iii 43; (3) of males above a month old belonging to the three Levitical families; (*a*) in the second year, chap. iii; (*b*) in the fortieth, chap. xxvi; (4) of male Levites between thirty and fifty years of age, chap. iv.

"1. The tribes in the table below are arranged according to their size at the first census; the order in the text of chap. i (in chap. xxvi it is the same, except that Manasseh precedes Ephraim) is indicated by the bracketed number to the left; the sign + or — to the right indicates that the tribe is represented as having increased or diminished in the interval between the two censuses, and the bracketed figure to the right indicates the order of size in chap. xxvi.

	Chap. i, year 2.		Chap. xxvi, year 40.	
(4)	Judah	74,600	76,500 +	(1)
(10)	Dan	62,700	64,400 +	(2)
(2)	Simeon	59,300	22,200 −	(12)
(6)	Zebulun	57,400	60,500 +	(4)
(5)	Issachar	54,400	64,300 +	(3)
(12)	Naphtali	53,400	45,400 −	(8)
(1)	Reuben	46,500	43,730 −	(9)

	Chap. i, year 2.	Chap. xxvi, year 40.	
(3) Gad	45,650	40,500 −	(10)
(11) Asher	41,500	53,400 +	(5)
(7) Ephraim	40,500	32,500 −	(11)
(9) Benjamin	35,400	45,600 +	(7)
(8) Manasseh	32,200	52,700 +	(6)
Totals	603,550	601,730	

"2. The firstborn male Israelites above a month old number 22,273.

"3. The numbers of male Levites are:—

	Above 1 month old.	Between 30 and 50 years.
Kohath	8600	2750
Gershom	7500	2630
Merari	6200	3200
Total	22,000 (in text) 22,300 (actual)	8580

"At the second census (xxvi 62) 23,000.

"These numbers must on every ground be regarded as entirely unhistorical and unreal; for (1) they are impossible; (2) treated as real, and compared with one another, they yield absurd results; and (3) they are inconsistent with numbers given in earlier Hebrew literature.

"1. The total represented is impossible. Males over twenty form but very little more than a quarter of a whole population, thus (neglecting the 51,000 odd Levites) the total in chap. i f. (603,550) represents a total of men, women, and children well exceeding 2,000,000. And yet this multitude is represented as spending forty years in the wilderness! The impossibility cannot be avoided by the assumption that the two millions wandered far and wide; for (1) this is not the representation of the text, according to which, for example, they camped in a fixed order (chap. ii), and marched together at a signal given by two trumpets (chap. x); and (2) the numbers are impossible even if we think of them as dispersed over the whole peninsula of Sinai, the present population of which is estimated at from 4000 to 6000.

"'As we saw the peninsula,' writes Robinson (*Bibl. Researches*, i. 106), 'a body of two millions of men could not subsist there a week without drawing their supplies of water, as well as of provisions, from a great distance.' By a miracle, no doubt, this multitude might have been sustained; but it ought to be observed that the miracles actually *recorded* are not on an adequate scale; for let any one read the story in xx 1–13, and ask himself whether this suggests a water supply sufficient for a multitude equal to the combined populations of Glasgow, Liverpool, and Birmingham. It must suffice to

bring this number once more to the touchstone of reality. The number at the end of the wilderness period is virtually the same as at the beginning, *i.e.* we are to think of two million people ready to fall on and settle in Canaan, already long inhabited. Now, what data exist point to about one million as the outside population of Israel and Judah when settled in the country; even this population representing a density of about 150 to the square mile, *i.e.* a density nearly twice that of Spain, and about the same as that of Denmark or Scotland.

"The numbers of the several tribes must stand or fall with the total.

"It is the great merit of Colenso to have demonstrated the absolute impossibility of the numbers; and to his discussion (*Pentateuch*, pt. i. chap. iv.–xiii.) reference must be made for further detail. Colenso, being concerned with the credibility of the Pentateuch as a whole, very properly tests the compatibility of the numbers with statements in any part of the whole. In what is here said they are compared only with the statements in P.

"2. The unreality of the numbers is independently proved by comparing them one with another. Thus: the number of male firstborn is 22,273; allowing the number of female firstborn to be equal, the total number of firstborn is 44,546, and, therefore, the total number of Israelites being between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000, the average number of children to a family is about 50! Again, if, as is probable, the firstborn of the *mother* is intended (cp. iii 12), then, since the number of firstborn and of mothers must have been identical, there were 44,546 mothers: but the number of women being approximately the same as of men, the women over twenty numbered something over 600,000, and therefore only about 1 in 14 or 15 women over twenty were mothers! The comparison of the two sets of Levitical figures bring less absurd, but still unreal, results to light. The average European percentage of persons (male and females) between thirty and fifty years of age to the *whole* population is barely 25, and in the U. S. A. the percentage is 22; but the percentage (males only considered) among the Kohathites is 32, the Gershonites 35, the Merarites 52. For the sake of simplicity the numbers are here taken as they stand; some slight difference would be made by allowing for children under a month, or again by adopting the view that firstborn means the firstborn to the father, and then allowing for the influence of polygamy; but no legitimate allowance or device can get rid of the essential impossibility of the figures. For a full discussion and an account of the attempts to surmount the difficulties, see Colenso, *Pentateuch*, pt. i. chap. xiv.; pt. vi. p. 500 ff.

"3. The 40,000 (? fighting men) of Jud. v 8 stands in striking contrast with the 301,000 (first census 273,300) of men above twenty assigned in Nu. xxvi to the six tribes (Benjamin, Ephraim, Manas-

seh, Naphtali, Zebulun, Issachar) celebrated in Deborah's song as participating in the war. Again, the male Danites above twenty, according to the census, just before settling in Canaan numbered 64,000; in Jud. xviii we have a narrative recording a migration of at least a considerable part of the tribe of Dan: yet the migrating party includes only 600 armed men.

"But if the numbers are unhistorical, how did they arise, and how much do they mean? The total, 600,000, was derived by P from the earlier work JE (Ex. xii 37, Nu. xi 21), unless we assume that the original number in these two earlier passages has been removed by a later harmonising scribe in favour of P's 600,000. How the number was obtained we are just as little able to determine as in the parallel cases of high numbers elsewhere (*e.g.* Jud. xx 2, 17, 2 S. xxiv 9); it must suffice to have shown that they are impossible even under the conditions prevailing after the settlement in Canaan. The exacter totals (603,550 and 601,730) appear to have been given to gain an air of reality; in the same way the numbers of the individual tribes are not precisely $\frac{600,000}{12}$, *i.e.* 50,000 for each tribe; but the numbers are so manipulated that in each census precisely six tribes have over and precisely six under 50,000; somewhat similarly the number of the Levitical cities (48) is represented not as 12×4, but as 13+10+13+12 (Jos. xxi 4–7). Under the circumstances it seems likely that *all* the tribal numbers are purely artificial; though the number assigned to Judah presupposes a population not greatly in excess of a quarter of a million (which may be taken as a rough approximation to the actual population of the Southern Kingdom), and might, if it stood alone, be treated as an anachronism rather than an artifice. The fact that in both censuses Judah shows the largest numbers may be intentional, and due to the writer's desire to illustrate the pre-eminence of Judah (cp. p. 18); but for the most part no significance can be detected in, and was probably not intended to attach to, either the numbers of the several tribes themselves or the variations between the first and second census.

"The numbers of the male firstborn (22,273) and the male Levites (22,000) are intimately connected. Since the impossibility of the proportion noted above forbids us to believe that the number of the male firstborn was inferred from the total number of male adults, we must consider it based on the number of Levites, a slight excess (273) being attributed to the firstborn in order to admit of an illustration of the law of xviii 16. But this consideration leads us further. The number of the Levites was reached independently and without reference to the 600,000. Whence or how we cannot say: it is more moderate than the Chronicler's impossible figure (38,000 over thirty years old = about 94,000 over a month old), but scarcely corresponds to reality at any period." (Gray, Numbers, pp. 10–15.)

That the numbers as stated in our present Hebrew text are impossible must be immediately conceded. We do not believe them to be correct as they stand. But, in order to use them in support of the higher critical position, it would be necessary to show that the documentary hypothesis removes, or at any rate alleviates, the difficulty. After what we have seen of the mathematical feats of the critics, nobody will be surprised to learn that, far from doing this, it actually doubles the embarrassment.

The present numbers might be claimed as supporting the hypothesis, if it could be shown, either that they were confined to one of the documents (leaving the other with no numerical statements at all, or else only with statements that were credible), or, at any rate, that one of the documents contained no representations that were inconsistent with these numbers. The exact opposite is the case. The inflated numbers are found in JE as well as in P, while the other statements of P make it quite clear that his own conception of the number of the Israelites was very moderate. It must further be remembered that we are dealing with men who have proved their incapacity for remembering the book of Joshua, and that book naturally helps to dislodge the theory.

Before indicating the lines along which in our opinion the solution of the problem is to be sought, we propose to examine first the statements of JE, and then those of P, with a view to showing in detail that the documentary theory provides absolutely no assistance.

1. JE: In Exodus i. 9, 20b; v. 5 (all J), language is used (more or less rhetorical in nature) implying that the Israelites are very numerous, yet in iii. 8 the same source speaks of Canaan as "a good land and a large," which it certainly was not if the standard for judging it is to be found in the 600,000

fighting men that J gives the Israelites in xii. 37. On the other hand, in i. 15 ff., E regards two midwives as sufficient for the needs of the whole community. Exodus xiv. 7 (E) is textually doubtful, but it speaks of at least 600 chariots as going in pursuit. This, though probably quite inadequate for the 600,000, suggests a considerable force. At Elim J apparently finds twelve springs of water sufficient for the needs of the people (xv. 27). In the next chapter E supplies them with water by smiting a rock. Certainly in this and all the other water passages it must be admitted that there is nothing to suggest "a water supply sufficient for a multitude equal to the combined populations of Glasgow, Liverpool and Birmingham." The organization of Exodus xviii. recognizes a body large enough to need rulers of thousands (E); but this does not carry the matter much further. Exodus xxiii. gives us considerable light. The command to make the three pilgrimage festivals (xxiii. 17 (E or a harmonist); xxxiv. 23 f. (J and R^d)) could hardly have been intended to apply to anything like 600,000 people, while the language of xxiii. 29 f. (E), promising that the Canaanites shall only be driven out gradually, "lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee," would, as Colenso has pointed out, be ridiculous in the case of a small land like Canaan if the Israelites numbered some 2,000,000. In xxxii. 28 (J) about 3000 men fall. Numbers x. 36 is a fragment of song and thousands may mean families; so that it would not be safe to draw any numerical inference from this passage. In Numbers xi. 21 (J) we once more find the 600,000 footmen; but in xx. a water-supply is again drawn from a rock, and part of this narrative belongs to the same source. "Who can count the dust of Jacob, or number the fourth part of Israel" (Num. xxiii. 10 (E)) is another poetical passage, which cannot be pressed into service for

statistical purposes, and we pass to the book of Joshua. The compassing of Jericho in chapter vi. (partly J and partly E) obviously excludes the idea of the army's numbering anything that faintly approached 600,000 warriors. In vii. (J) the people are thrown into a panic by the defeat of some three thousand men, with thirty-six killed! In viii. J knows of an ambush of 30,000 (ver. 3), but E has only 5000 (ver. 12), and the total adult population of Ai (male and female) was only 12,000 (ver. 25).

Such are the principal data of JE. It will be seen that there is a glaring discrepancy between a few figures and the rest of the narrative.

2. Like J, P uses language of a rhetorical character indicating that the Israelites were numerous (Ex. i. 7). He too gives the various numbers set out in the above extract from Dr. Gray, which need not be repeated here, and these appear at first sight to be confirmed by Exodus xxxviii. 25 f. In addition we find that 14,700 Israelites died on one occasion (Num. xvi. 49 (Hebrew xvii. 14)) and 24,000 on another (Num. xxv. 9). But side by side with these passages we find an entirely different representation. P's ideas of an adequate water-supply are identical with those of J and E (Num. xx., etc.). His tabernacle and sacred furniture are so small and light as to be capable of transportation in six pair-ox wagons assisted by Levitical porters. The Israelites are so few that all the higher priestly duties can be discharged by the males of a single family. The camps are all within sound of two trumpets (Num. x. 2). The congregation can assemble without difficulty at the door of the tabernacle (Lev. viii. 4). In Numbers xxxi. he sends an expedition against the Midianites, but the warriors number only 12,000 (4 f.), though the booty seems rather large (ver. 32–54). But it is in Joshua that the greatest surprise

awaits us. Unfortunately we have only one number there, but it is in irreconcilable conflict with the data of the book of Numbers. According to the last census, Reuben had 43,730 fighting men, and Gad 40,500. Yet, in Joshua, the united forces of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh amounted, according to the Hebrew text, to only 40,000 (iv. 13). How can this be made to fit in with the critical theory?

The fact is that the documentary theory does not solve the difficulties of the numbers: it shirks them. We must look elsewhere for the desired explanation.

On the materials that are at present available it is impossible to restore the original numbers; but it is possible to go some way behind the Massoretic text and show how they reached their present form. For this purpose it will be necessary to take into account facts that are habitually neglected.

1. We begin with Joshua iv. 13, where the fighting men of the trans-Jordanic tribes are given as 40,000. Here the solution is extremely easy. In Hebrew the tens from 30 to 90 are the plurals of the units. Now it is known that in Hebrew MSS. a final ם (the sign of the masculine plural) was frequently not written, and Lagarde, as reported by Dr. Driver, says that final ת and final ה were also omitted in MSS. used by the LXX, being represented by a mark of abbreviation (consisting of a little stroke).[1] It is well known that, although modern Hebrew writing distinguishes between the forms used in certain letters, according as they occur at the

[1] Samuel, p. lxix. We have not been able to see a copy of the work of Lagarde's to which Dr. Driver refers: but we would point out that there are ample examples in extant Hebrew MSS. and editions. See, for instance, pp. 601, 618, 820 of C. D. Ginsburg's "Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical edition of the Hebrew Bible." His chapter on "Abbreviations" should also be consulted. It is noteworthy that in some of Ginsburg's examples the abbreviations do not even have a mark to show that they are abbreviations.

end of a word or in some other position, such duplicate forms were not used earlier. Accordingly forty thousand could have been written ארבעאלפ, possibly with a little stroke after the ע. But this differs from 4000 either not at all, or, if the little strokes were used, only by the absence of the mark of abbreviation after the פ. It is, therefore, not surprising to learn that the Lucianic recension of the LXX actually has 4000 as the figure. It may be added that such variations of reading are extremely common. For example, in Numbers i. 21, forty (thousand), one MS. omits the termination; in verse 27, for four, one MS. had in the first hand forty, while another has the final ה of ערבעה over an erasure (a fact that points in the same direction); in 1 Samuel xiii. 5 the Lucianic LXX and the Syriac have 3000 for the Hebrew 30,000. It would seem that in our passage of Joshua the reading 4000 is clearly preferable, and this number may be historical. In any case it cannot be far from the mark.

2. The case of the Pentateuchal numbers is far more complicated. We must therefore break it up into sections for the purpose of discussion. We begin with Exodus xxxviii. 25 ff., which states that the silver produced by the ransom of souls at the census amounted to 100 talents 1775 shekels. At first sight this appears to confirm the census numbers; but on closer investigation it becomes evident that there is something wrong with the text. In the first place, this passage depends on the census, which was not taken until *after* the erection of the tabernacle. Secondly, a comparison of xxxviii. 24–31 with xxv. 3 and xxxv. 22–24 shows that something has been lost. In xxv. 3 God commands the taking of an offering of three metals — gold, silver, and brass (bronze). In xxxvi. we read that offerings of these three metals were in fact brought: in this passage of xxxviii. we read of the use made of the gold

and the brass, and we expect to find an account of the silver between the other two metals. Instead we meet with this misplaced passage, referring to the census. Moreover the command for the ransom of souls in xxx. 11–16 provides that the proceeds shall be used for the *service* of the tent of meeting, not for its erection. When we combine these facts with what we have already learned about the order of the Pentateuchal narrative and the divergence of the Septuagint in these chapters, the inference seems plain. These chapters go back to a MS. that was defective. The account of the use of the silver offering had perished. To make this good, the account of the census was removed from its proper position and inserted here. It is impossible to say what other editorial adjustments the text may have undergone. The evidence of the LXX seems to show that the text was known to be in a bad condition, and that various attempts were made to produce a satisfactory version of it.[1] But, for our purpose, it is sufficient to

[1] It is no part of our plan to discuss the difficulties that beset the account of the Tabernacle, as this requires expert knowledge that we lack. At the same time we think it right to point to certain phenomena that have been overlooked:—

1. As shown above, the account demonstrably contained at least one lacuna. It is, therefore, perfectly possible that it may have contained others, and that this is the explanation (at any rate in part) of the omissions of which the critics complain.

2. It will become increasingly clear that very little reliance can be placed on the numbers. The amount of the silver here obviously depends on the census numbers, which are corrupt. In the case of the brass, Kennicott records an extant Hebrew variant giving twenty as the number of talents, instead of seventy; while the facts we shall have to note about the transmission of Hebrew numbers are such as to make it impossible to condemn any narrative on the ground that the numbers it contains are excessive. These phenomena, together with the evidence of the LXX and the divergence in the statement of Deuteronomy as to the construction of the Ark, seem to show that the text of these chapters has suffered very seriously in transmission.

see that these verses belong properly to the account of the first census, and that the numbers they contain will stand or fall with the latter.

3. Coming now to the census itself, there is extant evidence to show that the text once existed in a form in which Gad lacked fifty of the numbers now assigned to that tribe in Numbers i. 25. Owing to the amount of information available, the importance of this greatly exceeds that of the number involved, for we are enabled to see clearly one of the ways in which the numbers grew.

At present the numbers of Gad are forty and five thousand six hundred and fifty. Three of Kennicott's Hebrew MSS. (including 6) omit "and fifty," and these are confirmed by two Greek MSS. (54 and 75 according to Holmes's notation, i.e. the g and n of the new Cambridge Septuagint) and the Georgian. With regard to the number of the hundreds, one Hebrew MS. omits the word, another reads "and five," while a third (6) has the first two letters (i.e. the וש of ושש over an erasure. The interpretation we put upon these facts is as follows: At a time when Gad had only a round number of hundreds, corruption set in. Two readings arose — six hundred and five hundred. The five was inserted in the margin of one or more MSS. that read six hundred. Then it was taken into the text and read as "fifty," in accordance with the common mistake that we have already explained. The sum total of the Israelites in i. 46; ii. 32, and its dependent number in the half-shekel ransom were then altered to agree, and this number was impressed on all the MSS. Fortunately in a few cases the numbers of Gad were not brought into harmony with the new form of the text. No. 6 had 500 originally, and traces survive in the other MSS. Similarly in ii. 15 a memory of the earlier text is preserved by two other Hebrew MSS., that

again omit "and 50." Thus it was that the scholarship of a past age reinforced the hosts of Israel with a contingent of fifty paper Gadites.

Before passing from this source of MS. corruption, we would draw attention to another biblical passage in which it has probably been at work. In 1 Samuel vi. 19 we read of the smiting of "seventy men, fifty thousand men." Yet in the text as known to Josephus the casualties appear to have amounted to seventy only. Doubtless the "fifty" represented a variant to the seventy with the result that "fifty men" was written in the margin, while the thousand came in as the result of the source of corruption next to be mentioned.

4. A study of the variants to the census figures collected by Kennicott reveals the fact that a large number of readings depend upon the undue omission or insertion of the Hebrew word for thousand. Here are some illustrations:—

Reference.	Received Text.	Variant.
Num. i. 23.	Fifty thousand.	1 MS. (109) thousand and fifty.
Num. i. 33.	Forty thousand.	2 MSS. (84 and 189) omit thousand.
Num. i. 35.	Two and thirty thousand.	1 MS. (107) omits thousand.
Num. ii. 6.	Fifty thousand.	1 MS. (109) omits thousand.
Num. ii. 11.	Forty thousand.	1 MS. (189) omits thousand.
Num. ii. 16.	A hundred thousand.	1 MS. (109) omits thousand.
Ibid.	And four hundred and fifty.	1 MS. (89) and four hundred and fifty thousand.

When it is remembered that we have ample evidence of the use of abbreviations in Hebrew MSS., it is natural to suspect that variations of this kind are due to the use of some abbreviation for thousand which was readily inserted or omitted in mistake, and that the archetypes of 109 and 189, in particular,

presented texts which frequently differed from the generally received tradition.

5. A number of facts may be explained by another conjecture which is also based on the known partiality for abbreviations. The use of a single letter to denote a word is abundantly testified by our existing material. Now the initial letter of the Hebrew word for hundred is מ, the final letter of the tens. The supposition lies near at hand that in some cases a מ, written as the final letter of a ten was mistaken by a copyist for an abbreviation for the word "hundred." Thus, in 2 Samuel xxiv. 9, Israel has 800,000 warriors and Judah 500,000. It is suggested that, in an age when MS. abbreviations were common, these figures may have arisen from a misreading of 80,000 and 50,000 respectively. Similarly, in 2 Chronicles xiii. 3, where the received text has *four hundred* ארבע מאות one MS. reads *fourteen* (ארבע עשר for מאות). Such a variant would naturally arise if the second word were represented by a single letter which had become illegible, and was consequently misread by a scribe.

6. It is well known that a study of biblical numbers reveals a general tendency to multiply by ten, even where the palæographical peculiarities noted above do not assist the process. Thus in Numbers xxxi. 37–40 the Syriac reads 6750 for 675, 720 for 72, 610 for 61, 320 for 32. Similarly Canon R. B. Girdlestone writes, as the result of his comparison of the texts of Kings and Chronicles, that the Chronicler "tends to turn hundreds into thousands and sometimes the LXX does the same."[1] This tendency must be borne in mind in any estimate of the processes through which the numbers have passed.

7. Our evidence further shows that there were certain

[1] Deuterographs (1894), p. x.

cases in which the number of the original text had become quite uncertain. For instance, in Numbers i. 23, the received text has 300, one MS. of Kennicott's 500, another 700; while Lucian read 400. Or, again, in Numbers xxvi. 47, for the 400 of the ordinary texts, one MS. has 500, another 700, two others have the usual reading over erasures, while the LXX reads 600. Examples could, of course, be multiplied with ease, but these will suffice to illustrate the fact that there are cases within our knowledge where an original number had simply become corrupt, and no man can say whether any of the various readings is to be preferred, and, if so, which, or whether the original is not represented by any extant text.

8. Some of these illustrations also give us the clue to another factor that has been at work in the formation of our present text. The books were studied by persons who could of course add up figures, and, at any rate in some instances, the text has been amended on an arithmetical basis; thus, to take the case just cited, where Lucian reads 400 in Numbers i. 23, as against the 300 of the Hebrew text. If this stood alone the total of the fighting men in verse 46 would necessarily be wrong, but the difficulty is removed by his reading 600 for 700 in verse 39. Similarly his text makes the numbers of the Levites in chapter iii. add up correctly, for it presents us with 7200 Gershonites in verse 22, instead of the 7500 of the Massoretic text, thus arriving at the total 22,000 stated in verse 39. In such cases it is clear that scribes have made changes in a faulty text in deference to the principles of addition.

9. One other factor must be taken into account. In determining between various possibilities, some criterion must have been employed by those whose duty it was to hand on the text. If a word could be read as either four or forty, the choice of reading must have been made for some reason or other. Now

it is material to observe that the Pentateuch was copied in ages when the Israelites were infinitely more numerous than in the days of Moses: and it is probable that the judgment of the scribes would be swayed rather by their knowledge of the conditions of their own day than by historical considerations. The historical spirit is not found at all periods of human history. Further, national pride would probably tend in the same direction. It is not every age that has a statistical conscience. Hence there would usually be a marked leaning towards the larger number.

We think, therefore, that the most probable account of the present form of the numbers may be simply stated as follows: Numbers that were originally correct underwent corruption in the first instance partly through the ordinary decay of a MS. text, and partly through the peculiarities of Hebrew writing. These causes were reinforced by a natural but unfortunately misleading theory of the copying scribes and by well-meant but unhappy attempts to correct obvious errors. These causes, acting sometimes successively, sometimes jointly, have resulted in our present received text, but the last stages of the process can still be traced in some instances: and by arguing from the known to the unknown we can obtain some adequate understanding of the way in which our present difficulties arose.

THE WAR WITH MIDIAN.

The thirty-first chapter of Numbers has been the object of particularly numerous onslaughts by the critics. Colenso attacked it on chronological grounds. We have met this in our discussion of the chronology of the concluding chapters of Numbers. Dr. Gray (Numbers, pp. 418 f.) claims that the story is not history, but *Midrash*. His reasons appear to be: (1) that if every male Midianite was slain, Midian must have

disappeared from history in the time of Moses, whereas it is found subsequently; (2) that the law of the division of the booty (ver. 25–30) "is an inference from ancient Hebrew custom" (1 Sam. xxx. 24 f.); and (3) that it is incredible that "the Israelites, while slaughtering a multitude, never lose a single man." It is true that this is not all he writes. Thus he complains that verses 19–24 merely describe the application of the law of chapter xix.; but, as this and similar remarks have no probative force whatever, they may be neglected. Now, as to "every male Midianite," we have already explained that "all" is not a mathematical term and need not be pressed. Further we cannot help thinking that the Midianites in question were really a subdivision of the tribe. Such a view presents no difficulty when it is understood that the Midianites were a nomadic Arabian tribe, so that the reference is probably to that particular branch of the tribe which had been implicated in the sin against Israel. With regard to the law of booty we exposed this confusion on pages 113 f. of the Bibliotheca Sacra for January, 1908, and need not labor the point further. Lastly, we see no incredibility in the statement that on this expedition no lives were lost; but this remark must be qualified by another, viz. that there seems no particular reason for assuming that the numbers (which are very large) may not have suffered in transmission, owing to the causes already indicated.

On the other hand, there is one very important legal point on this chapter which entirely rebuts the late *Midrash* theory. Moses expressly permits unions with Midianitish women (ver. 18). This, it is hardly necessary to say, is in entire accord with the views and practice of the husband of Zipporah, who forbade unions with foreign women for the high priest only, but for no other Israelite, and laid down express provisions (Deut. xxi. 10–14) for the regulation of unions with foreign

captives. But it is utterly alien to the spirit and practice of Ezra, Nehemiah, and the supposititious priestly school. If there was one thing that was anathema to Ezra and Nehemiah, it was a union with a foreign woman.

CONCLUSION.

We have now carried out our promise to investigate the assertions of the higher critics respecting the main difficulties alleged in regard to the narrative of the last four books of the Pentateuch, and our readers can form their own opinions of the competence of the higher critics to deal with the matters in question. It will be in place that, in conclusion, we should say a few words on the question of authorship.

The secure basis of the inquiry will in the future be the indubitable Mosaic authenticity of the speeches in Deuteronomy (apart from certain well-known glosses). That authenticity can be proved by three separate lines of argument: First, it is most distinctly asserted that these speeches are by Moses. Secondly, the covenant structure of the book (as well as the style) makes it certain that they are from the same hand as the laws, and the authenticity of these laws cannot be doubtful, save in inquiries conducted or dominated by men who are not jurists.[1] Thirdly, such passages as Deuteronomy xi. 10 are

[1] See Studies in Biblical Law, pp. 71–75. It may be worth while to point out the errors of Dr. Driver's reasoning with regard to Deuteronomy xxiii. 5 (4), "in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt." He writes: "Here, at any rate, where the reference is to a date at the *close* of the 40 years' wanderings, the expression 'when ye came forth out of Egypt' could not have been used by a contemporary, writing but six months afterwards, but betrays the writer of a later age, in which the 40 years had dwindled to a point." (Deuteronomy, p. 61.) The fact is that the reference is to an incident which, though not narrated in our present text of Numbers, had occurred some thirty-eight years previously. Moses had sent from Kadesh not merely to Edom, as stated in Numbers, but also

only applicable to the Mosaic age, and would not have been forged at any subsequent time.

But these speeches will inevitably carry with them large portions of the anonymous narrative of the preceding books which are intimately connected with them. In this matter the labors of the critics have not been wholly fruitless, but have gone far to show the intimacy of connection between Deuteronomy and passages in the earlier books.

(Judges xi. 17) to the king of Moab. It is quite clear, from the language of Jephthah's message, that this took place near the beginning of the forty years. It is natural that Moses, speaking some thirty-eight years later, should use the phrase "when ye came forth out of Egypt" to refer to this period. The same phrase is used to designate the same period in Deuteronomy xxiv. 9 (Miriam's leprosy on the way to Kadesh) and xxv. 17 (Amalek's attack at Rephidim). Indeed had the reference in this passage been to the forty years as a point, we should have had "because they met you not with bread . . . . and because they hired Balaam . . . ., when ye came forth out of Egypt." But the actual text of Deuteronomy puts the phrase about Egypt after the charge of not meeting the Israelites, thus showing that this charge, as contrasted with the accusation of hiring Balaam (which occurred later) refers to an earlier period.

Two other phrases are sometimes pressed into service by the critics — "at that time" and "beyond Jordan." In both cases the answer is the same, viz. that the use of language is determined by the linguistic feeling of the age, and not by the dogmas of strangers living three thousand years later. "At that time" can obviously be used in Hebrew idiom where an English writer would probably choose "then." But that proves nothing as to authorship. As to the other phrase, "beyond Jordan" is used in the speeches once of the East (Deut. iii. 8) in a passage which Mr. Carpenter does not regard as original, and three times of the West (iii. 20, 25; xi. 30). This probably should merely be held to show that here again Hebrew idiom is different from English (see especially Num. xxxii. 19, 32; xxxv. 14). The force of the passages in Numbers may, however, be held by some (as by Dr. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. xliii, note, as to Numbers xxxii. 14) to be broken by other considerations. Yet at the worst Deuteronomy iii. 8 could only be regarded as proving that Mr. Carpenter is right in thinking this verse an interpolation. It shows a hopeless lack of sense of proportion to deny the Mosaic origin of these lengthy speeches on the ground of a single phrase in *one* verse!

While, therefore, it is undoubtedly the fact that the Pentateuch contains post-Mosaic elements, the possible extent of such elements will be recognized as very much more restricted than is now supposed to be the case, while the wild theories at present current as to documents, schools of writers, forgers of laws, revelation by literary fraud, etc., will be recognized as merely absurd. On the other hand, the duties of the textual critic will be seen to possess far more importance than has been generally allowed.

The effect of such conclusions on the views entertained of the history of Israel must of course be prodigious. Genuine Mosaic legislation, genuine Mosaic prophecies, genuine Mosaic narratives, will revolutionize current conceptions of Old Testament history. And the work done by conservative Pentateuchal criticism is being reinforced by the discoveries of archæology. Colenso could write: "If our view be correct, then the use of the word Salem,[1] also, especially as it occurs in the substance of the main story, would indicate a writer living in later times; since the Canaanitish name of the city was Jebus, Josh. xviii. 28, Jud. xix. 10, 11, and there can be little doubt that the name Jerusalem, 'possession of peace,' was first given to it by David, after its capture by him from the Jebusites." (The Pentateuch, Part ii. p. 218.) No critic could now be found to indorse this view, seeing that the Tell-el-Amarna tablets have disposed of this notion once for all. Similarly it is extremely improbable that Mr. Carpenter would now argue elaborately for a late date for "J" on the ground that it takes the Tetragrammaton to have been known early and used outside Israel.[2] Nor, again, in view of the fresh evidence

[1] Gen. xiv. 18.

[2] Oxford Hexateuch, vol. i. p. 107. It is probable that the Tetragrammaton has not yet been discovered in Babylonian material. See an article by Dr. S. Daiches in the Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, 1908.

published by Mr. King, is it possible to hold that "there are grave chronological embarrassments affecting the contemporaneousness of Abraham with the Mesopotamian kings."[1] The progress of monumental research is gradually grinding such arguments out of the critical case, and the process, if slow, is at any rate singularly effective.

But if it should hereafter be found in early cuneiform tablets, the discovery would only confirm the statement of Genesis.

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. i. p. 158.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF WELLHAUSEN'S PROLEGOMENA.

In the "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism"[1] the current analysis of the last four books of the Law was carefully tested. It is natural to follow them up with an examination of the main historical theory that has been reared on that analysis. I begin with Dr. Driver's statement of one of the underlying postulates of that theory. He writes as follows on pages 145 and 146 of his "Deuteronomy":—

". . . . By ancient custom in Israel, slaughter and sacrifice were identical (cf. phil. note, below): the flesh of domestic animals, such as the ox, the sheep, and the goat (as is still the case among the Arabs) was not eaten habitually; when it was eaten, the slaughter of the animal was a sacrificial act, and its flesh could not be lawfully partaken of, unless the fat and blood were first presented at an altar. . . . So long as local altars were legal in Canaan (Ex. xx 24), domestic animals slain for food in the country districts could be presented at one of them: with the limitation of all sacrifice to a central sanctuary, the old rule had necessarily to be relaxed; a distinction had to be drawn between slaughtering for food and slaughtering for sacrifice; the former was permitted freely in all places . . . . the latter was prohibited except at the one sanctuary."

Yet on page 145 itself Dr. Driver in the philological note referred to in the above extract explains that the word for "kill" in Deuteronomy xii. 15 "denotes to slaughter simply," and compares 1 Samuel xxviii. 24; 1 Kings xix. 21, i.e. *two passages relating to times when, according to his*

[1] *Supra*, pp. 1–174.

former note, non-sacrificial slaughter was unknown. I once had some correspondence with an eminent critic on this point, and after the exchange of some letters wrote as follows:—

On the question whether all slaughter was sacrificial, you write, "I have no hesitation in saying that in 1 Sam xxviii 24 there was a sacrifice." No doubt the reason for your attitude is that you were away from books and could not refer to the other passages cited in my pamphlet. I would therefore specifically put the following questions to you which may decide you. (*a*) What *reasons* have you for saying there was a sacrifice in 1 Sam. xxviii. 24? What *evidence* have you for your theory on this point? (*b*) Was there a sacrifice of the calf in Gen. xviii. 7? if so, who performed it? I repeat these questions as to (*c*) Gen. xxvii. 9–14; (*d*) Gen. xliii. 16; (*e*) 1 Sam. xxv. 11; (*f*) 1 Kings xix. 21. (*g*) I further ask (i) whether in each one of these cases there was an altar, and (ii) whether in each case the place was holy as the result till the time of Josiah. (*h*) In Ex. xxi. 37 does the legislation contemplate *sacrifice* of stolen animals and places made holy as the result? (*i*) In Judg. vi. 19 Gideon "made ready a kid" and put some broth in a pot and brought them out to the angel. They were then put on a rock and consumed by flames. Had Gideon already sacrificed the kid and the animal from which the broth was made when he killed them? And at an altar? And did that sacrifice also make the place holy till the time of Josiah? I would also remind you that in the preceding letter you said that it was impossible to adduce direct evidence to show that all slaughter was sacrificial till Josiah's time. I respectfully submit that it is possible to adduce direct evidence that it was not.

I regret to say that I entirely failed to get any answer to these questions; and I hope that those of my readers who may know higher critics will persistently put to them these and other questions until satisfactory answers are given to the public. The critics are fond of claiming that all thoughtful and unprejudiced men accept their theory.[1] Surely

[1] See, for example, Dr. C. F. Burney in the Journal of Theological Studies, April, 1908, p. 321. "This latter hypothesis [i.e. the Graf-Wellhausen theory], with the reconstruction which it involves of our view of the development of Israel's religion *after* B.C. 750, may now be regarded as proved up to the hilt for any thinking and unprejudiced man who is capable of estimating the character and value of the evidence."

those to whom, on their own showing, Providence has given a monopoly of thoughtfulness and freedom from prejudice cannot refuse to answer the reasonable interrogatories of less favored mortals.

It is proper to note that Wellhausen makes this blunder at the very outset of his inquiry. He writes of the days of Saul: " . . . to sacrifice anywhere — or to slaughter anywhere; for originally the two words are absolutely synonymous." [1] Similarly (on p. 50) he writes of Leviticus xvii.:—

> "The intention of this prescription is simply and solely to secure the exclusive legitimation of the one lawful place of sacrifice; it is only for this, obviously, that the profane slaughtering outside of Jerusalem, which Deuteronomy had permitted, is forbidden. Plainly the common man did not quite understand the newly drawn and previously quite unknown distinction between the religious and the profane act, and when he slaughtered at home (as he was entitled to do), he in doing so still observed, half unconsciously perhaps, the old sacred sacrificial ritual."

Immediately afterwards he argues that Leviticus xvii. must be exilic at the earliest. " Newly drawn and previously quite unknown distinction " is therefore, in view of the passages cited above, entirely typical of Wellhausen's dogmatic, unhistorical methods. And on the next page, in dealing with Leviticus vii. 22–27, he writes: " Here accordingly is another instance of what we have already so often observed: what is brought forward in Deuteronomy as an innovation is assumed in the Priestly Code to be an ancient custom dating as far back as Noah. And therefore the latter code is a growth of the soil that has been prepared by means of the former." [2] Again, on page 63 we read, " In this way, not

[1] Prolegomena, p. 18. The references are to the English translation throughout.

[2] So, too, W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites (2d Ed.), p. 241, etc. The whole Wellhausen literature is honeycombed with this theory.

by any means every meal indeed, but every slaughtering, came to be a sacrifice." On page 71 we are told that "according to the praxis of the older period a meal was almost always connected with a sacrifice . . . there was no offering without a meal, and no meal without an offering." And when he has dilated sufficiently on this theme Wellhausen proceeds (on the next page) to contrast the data of P: "Slaying and sacrificing are no longer coincident," and so on. On pages 77 f. we meet with some wonderful reasoning on the (supposed) course of development:—

"Human life [we are solemnly told] has its root in local environment, and so also had the ancient cultus; in being transplanted from its natural soil it was deprived of its natural nourishment. A separation between it and the daily life was inevitable, and Deuteronomy itself paved the way for this result by permitting profane slaughtering. A man lived in Hebron, but sacrificed in Jerusalem; life and worship fell apart. The consequences which lie dormant in the Deuteronomic law are fully developed in the Priestly Code.

"This is the reason why the sacrifice combined with a meal, formerly by far the chief, now falls completely into the background. One could eat flesh at home, but in Jerusalem one's business was to do worship."

Assuredly it is not wonderful that a disciple of his hesitates to answer my questions.[1]

[1] In 1 Samuel viii. 13 the word translated "cooks" really means "slaughterers." H. P. Smith (*ad loc.*) writes in explanation, "The cook is also the butcher." It is also clear that the slaying of oxen and the killing of sheep in Isaiah xxii. 13 is purely non-sacrificial.

R. Kittel (Studien zur Hebräischen Archäologie und Religionsgeschichte (1908), p. 103) clearly recognizes that there was nothing sacrificial in Gideon's killing of the kid. But his discussion of the subject is vitiated by his not having recognized the other material passages (pp. 108–110). Indeed, the whole of Kittel's essay is rendered of small value for the biblical student by his neglect to collect the available Old Testament evidence, by an exegesis that reads into the texts whatsoever it desires to find, and by confused and improbable theories. The latest monograph on the places of sacrifice in the Pentateuchal laws (W. Engelkemper, Heiligtum und Opferstätten in den Gesetzen des Pentateuch (1908)) also fails to recognize the historical instances of non-sacrificial slaughter.

The great bulk of the first two chapters of Wellhausen's Prolegomena rests on two great confusions, supplemented by numerous minor confusions and blunders. Perhaps the most important of the minor blunders is one I have already refuted — the notion that slaughter and sacrifice were identical before the reign of Josiah. The great confusions are: (1) the confusion about sanctuaries; and (2) the confusion induced by the inability to distinguish between substantive law and procedure. I shall deal with these two in the order named. I have written of "sanctuaries" before; but, owing to the great importance of the matter to the Wellhausen case, it is necessary that I should treat of the point again, for it is of this chapter that Wellhausen writes: "I differ from Graf chiefly in this, that I always go back to the centralisation of the cultus, and deduce from it the particular divergences. My whole position is contained in my first chapter." (Prolegomena, p. 368.)

That first chapter has been rendered possible by two conditions: (1) his habitual neglect to collate the whole of the relevant evidence of any document (of which we shall see numerous instances); and (2) the mental confusion in which he involved himself by gratuitously calling various places and objects "sanctuaries." Although these matters are rather technical, I believe it to be possible to put them so that any man of ordinary intelligence who has had no special training shall be able to follow the argument and see what incredible blunders have been made.

The ancient Hebrews had a custom whereby any layman could in certain circumstances offer sacrifice. For this purpose he used a simple kind of altar, consisting either of one or more stones or of a mound of earth. Such altars could be made at a moment's notice, and were in fact frequently used for single occasions only. On the other hand, sometimes

(at any rate in the post-Mosaic age) the altar might be intended for regular use. A ready parallel is provided by the Arabs of whom Mr. Addis writes: "To the Arabs any stone might become for the nonce an altar, and evidently their Hebrew kinsfolk followed originally the same ancient way." (Encyclopædia Biblica, col. 123.) The words "for the nonce" are important. These stones were distinguished from what we should call a sanctuary by two characteristics at least. The term sanctuary implies: (1) some measure of permanence, and (2) some measure of peculiar holiness. Both these characteristics are obviously lacking in stones that could be used "for the nonce"; though, as we shall see, the element of permanence was not always lacking to altars of this type among the Hebrews.

Moses found this custom in existence. He made no effort to disturb it. On the contrary he practised it himself. But such a custom could easily lend itself to idolatry or apostacy. Accordingly he *regulated* it. We have two passages in which he does this — Exodus xx. 24–26 and Deuteronomy xvi. 21 f. Of these two passages only one (Ex. xx.) has been discovered by Wellhausen. The other is left out of his discussion. These passages contain certain provisions with which we need not now deal — provisions prohibiting heathen accessories. But other points are of immediate importance for our purpose. To begin with, we must speak of the materials. Earth and unhewn stone *only* are allowed. Steps are prohibited for a reason that applied only to laymen, and not to the priests, who were differently garbed.[1] We shall have to consider hereafter the sacrifices that might be offered on such altars; but

[1] Contrast Exodus xx. 26 with xxviii. 42 f. Ezekiel, at any rate, had no objection to the priests' approaching their altar by steps (xliii. 17), and in this he may possibly have followed Solomon.

for the moment I want to urge on my readers the importance of *visualizing* them. Everybody has seen a large stone, and also mounds of earth and unhewn stones; and nobody can have the slightest difficulty in picturing such things to himself. If now we turn to the historical instances, we shall see these stones and mounds. I recall such instances as Manoah's rock, Elijah's altar on Carmel, Saul's stone after Michmash, Naaman's earth, and so on. Once this is clearly realized, it becomes possible to distinguish these lay altars from two other objects. On the one hand, no eye-witness could mistake such an altar for a house: on the other hand, he could not confuse it with such an altar as the great altar of burnt-offering. That a stone or mound is not a house is a matter that need not be labored. I proceed therefore to draw attention to the altar of burnt-offering. Turning to the command in Exodus xxvii., we see the contrasts at once.

1. The altar of earth or unhewn stones (which for the future we may conveniently refer to as a "lay altar") must have been of indeterminate shape and varying dimensions, while this altar is "foursquare" and has defined dimensions.

2. Owing to the nature of its materials, a lay altar could have no horns. As against this we read, "And thou shalt make the horns of it upon the four corners thereof: the horns thereof shall be of one piece with it."

3. The altar of burnt-offering is not made of earth or stone, but of wood and metal.

4. The altar of burnt-offering has a grating and ledge.

5. It is served by priests, in striking contrast to the lay altar.

This does not exhaust the differences that might be gathered from the history; but it is sufficient for our present purpose. Side by side with the lay altar there obviously exists in

the Bible another form of altar. One of its most striking differences suggests to us the name "horned altar" for altars of this type. If my readers will visualize this as well as the lay altar, they will have no difficulty in following the discussion. They can obtain valuable assistance for this purpose by referring to the illustrations on page 31 of Murray's "Illustrated Bible Dictionary."[1]

Where were horned altars used? The answer appears to be, "At legitimate or illegitimate houses of God"; and in the term "house of God" I include the abiding-place of the Ark, before the erection of the Temple. This latter point is proved by two passages: 1 Kings i. 50 f., where we read of Adonijah's laying hold of the *horns* of the altar; and 1 Kings ii. 28 ff., where Joab flees to the Tent of the Lord, and catches hold of the *horns* of the altar. In neither case can the reference be to a lay altar, which could not have horns since it would be impossible to fashion them of earth or *unhewn* stone. As to other places of worship, Amos says (iii. 14): "For in the day that I shall visit the transgressions of Israel upon him, I will also visit the altars of Bethel, and *the horns of the altar shall be cut off,* and fall to the ground." "A house of the Lord," then, is not merely not a lay altar: it is not even an appendage of a *lay altar.* An altar it had, but an altar of an entirely different type — a horned altar. And such an altar existed before the Ark — at any rate as far back as the days of David and Solomon.[2]

[1] Both these types must be distinguished from the pre-Israelitish high places that have recently been investigated. It is foolish to say, as is sometimes done, "All altars were very much alike," and then to exhibit an elaborate picture of a Canaanitish high place to illustrate the law under which Saul after Michmash used a large stone as an altar. Such reasoning threatens us with new confusions based on undigested archæological data.

[2] From 1 Kings viii. 64 it appears that the temple altar was made of bronze.

Having now made it clear that a lay altar is not identical either with a house or with a horned altar, I turn to J and E to examine their data.

We have already seen that Exodus xx. recognizes lay altars. The legislation of J, however, also recognizes a "house of the LORD" (Ex. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26): "The first of the *bikkurim* of thy ground thou shalt bring to the House of the LORD." This, then, is not a lay altar. It is, however, a place of great importance in the worship. In Exodus xxxiv. 22 we find: "And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the *bikkurim* of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end." If the *bikkurim* were to be brought to the house of the LORD, where must the peasant have been on the feast of the *bikkurim?* Clearly at the house of the LORD, and not at a lay altar. It follows that this feast is intended to be celebrated at the house. But the same legislation links with this feast of *bikkurim* two other feasts — the feast of ingathering and Passover: "Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord GOD, the God of Israel" (Ex. xxxiv. 23). Now if on one of these three occasions the appearance consisted of a visit to the "House," it follows of necessity that a similar act was necessary on the other two occasions. These pilgrimages to the house of the LORD, and not to lay altars, are firmly established in the earliest legislation.

Precisely the same tale is told by the narrative of J. In Joshua ix. 23 we read of "hewers of wood and drawers of water for the *House of my God.*" What does that mean? What could it mean to a Judaean, such as J is alleged to have been, but the seat of the Ark? And in verse 27 when we remove the phrases that the Wellhausenites assign to other writers, we read that "Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the altar of the LORD."

Observe the altar, *not* the altars. A single definite altar is here referred to. Was it a lay altar? Can the answer be doubtful?

I return to one other passage in the legislation (Ex. xxi. 14): "From mine altar shalt thou take him, that he may die." What is here meant is clearly shown by the passage in Kings. The altar referred to cannot be a lay altar like the Michmash stone or Naaman's earth. It can only be a horned altar.[1] Thus it appears that J and E recognize a plurality of lay altars and also a single house with a horned altar.

Wellhausen in his famous chapter on "The Place of Worship" professes to discuss the evidence of J (pp. 29–32). He has not detected Exodus xxiii. or xxxiv. or Joshua ix. His discussion proceeds on the footing that Exodus xx. is the only legal passage material, and that some of the notices of the lay altars contained in the narrative are J's only historical data. I have often asked partisans of Wellhausen if they can show me any references to these passages in his discussion, but I never can get an answer. Perhaps some of my readers may be more fortunate.

I cannot pass by in silence another blunder of his in the interpretation of Exodus xx. 24. He translates "in *every*

[1] It is necessary to notice the mistranslation of Exodus xxii. 29 (30), which should run "on the eighth day thou *mayest* give it me." Similarly Deuteronomy xxii. 7 is not a command but a permission to bird's nest, and Exodus xiii. 13 contains not a command but a permission to redeem asses, as is proved by the next words. (See A. Van Hoonacker, Le lieu du culte, pp. 9–10.) Mistranslations are often useful to the higher critics. In this case they argue for local "sanctuaries" (!) on the strength of their rendering. Wellhausen argues that Passover "cannot have been known at all to the Book of the Covenant, for there (Exod. xxii. 29, 30) the command is to leave the firstling seven days with its dam and on the eighth day to give it to the LORD!" (Prolegomena, p. 93.) Here, as elsewhere, I substitute "the LORD" for Wellhausen's transliteration of the Tetragrammaton.

place where I cause my name to be honoured," and interprets this by saying: "But this means nothing more than that the spots where intercourse between earth and heaven took place were not willingly regarded as arbitrarily chosen, but, on the contrary, were considered as having been somehow or other selected by the Deity Himself for His service" (p. 30). Similarly, in dealing with the patriarchal altars, he writes: "All the more as the altars, as a rule, are not built by the patriarchs according to their own private judgment wheresoever they please; on the contrary, a theophany calls attention to, or at least afterwards confirms, the holiness of the place" (p. 31). This has been very generally followed by the critics. I will quote only one instance. Professor A. R. S. Kennedy writes on page 81 of Hastings's second Dictionary of the Bible: "As regards, first of all, the place of sacrifice, every village appears to have had its sanctuary or 'high place' with its altar and other appurtenances of the cult. . . . Not that sacrifice could be offered at any spot the worshipper might choose; it must be one hallowed by the tradition of a theophany: 'in every place, etc.'"

This might be a permissible explanation if we had no historical data to explain the meaning of the law; but, in view of our actual knowledge, it affords only one more example of Wellhausen's neglect to examine the facts. For instance, Saul erects an altar after Michmash, but no theophany can be suggested. Similarly with Samuel's altar at Ramah, Adonijah's sacrifice at Enrogel, Naaman's earth, etc. Moreover, if all slaughter was sacrificial, there must have been innumerable altars up and down the country. Can it really be suggested that theophanies are to be postulated in the case of the cattle thieves (Ex. xxi. 37 (xxii. 1)), or in Genesis xxvii. 14, or in the other passages we have examined?

Again, in 1 Samuel xx. 6, 29 we read of David's putting forward a clan sacrifice as a plausible excuse. To have been plausible it must have been not exceptional but in accordance with a universal custom. Not merely David's clan but every other clan in the country must have had such sacrifices. But sacrifice implies an altar — according to Wellhausen a theophany. Did every Israelitish householder have a theophany in his back garden?

The same holds good of earlier times. When men began to call upon the name of the Lord (Gen. iv. 26), did they do so altogether without sacrifice? Or did they enjoy innumerable theophanies? When Abram built an altar near Bethel (Gen. xii. 8), is a theophany suggested? Or at Mamre (xiii. 18)? Or in the case of Jacob's sacrifice in Gen. xxxi. 54? Or at Shechem (xxxiii. 20)?

The fact is that there are only two possibilities with regard to Exodus xx. Either we must translate the Hebrew, literally and correctly, "in all the place," understanding the reference to be to the territory of Israel for the time being (i.e. first the camp and its environment, subsequently the national possessions in Canaan); or else, if we insist on translating "in every place," we must adopt the Syriac reading "where *thou* shalt cause my name to be remembered." In any case the R. V. rendering is impossible. Personally I prefer the former alternative.[1]

I turn from Wellhausen's account of the early law to his account of the early history. At the beginning of his first chapter he writes as follows:—

"For the earliest period of the history of Israel, all that precedes the building of the temple, not a trace can be found of any sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy. In the Books of Judges and Samuel hardly a place is mentioned at which we have not at least casual

[1] See Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1908, p. 115, note.

mention of an altar and of sacrifice. In great measure this multiplicity of sanctuaries was part of the heritage taken over from the Canaanites by the Hebrews; as they appropriated the towns and the culture generally of the previous inhabitants, so also did they take possession of their sacred places. . . . In Gilgal and Shiloh, in the fixed camps where, in the first instance, they had found a permanent foothold in Palestine proper, there forthwith arose important centres of worship; so likewise in other places of political importance, even in such as only temporarily came into prominence, as Ophrah, Ramah, and Nob near Gibeah. And, apart from the greater cities with their more or less regular religious service, it is perfectly permissible to erect an altar extempore, and offer sacrifice whenever an occasion presents itself" (pp. 17, 18).

The first thing to notice is the hopeless mental confusion induced by the word "sanctuary." A place where there is casual mention of a lay altar and a lay sacrifice is regarded as a "sanctuary"; and when it has been established that a multiplicity of lay altars were in use, the leap is made to a multiplicity of sanctuaries.[1] A second result of this confusion (and it is a very important one indeed) is that Shiloh and afterwards Nob are lumped together with extempore lay altars. At Shiloh (subsequently at Nob) there was something which could be called a house or temple, served by a regular

[1] I have repeatedly pointed out that the confusion engendered by the word "sanctuary" reaches its climax in the writings of such authors as Driver and Robertson Smith. The latter writes: "The local sanctuaries were the seat of judgment, and so in the language of S [so he designates this "source"] to bring a man before the magistrates is to bring him 'to God' (Exod. xxi. 6; xxii. 8, 9, Heb.)" (Additional Answer to the Libel, p. 74.) It is well known that "the seat of judgment" was the gate of the city, not a lay altar: and it is tolerably obvious that the door or doorpost presupposed by Exodus xxi. is lacking to a stone or mound, albeit present in a gate. The stoutest opponents of the higher critics would have thought it impossible that they should be so hopelessly incompetent as to be unable to distinguish between a mound and a house, and that merely because they had called both these objects "sanctuaries"; but, unfortunately, the facts admit of no doubt. It is never wise in matters legal or historical to call a spade a sanctified excavatory implement.

priesthood; and these instances, therefore, bear not the slightest resemblance to the altars which any layman was free to erect and use for the sacrificial worship sanctioned by the custom of Israel. We have seen that the law and history of J and E recognize a house of the Lord with a horned altar side by side with a plurality of lay altars. We shall see that the same is the case with the history before the erection of Solomon's temple. The confusion induced by the word "sanctuary" has prevented Wellhausen from realizing this.

The second point to notice is that this passage — and indeed the whole chapter — is based, as usual with Wellhausen, on an incomplete collection of evidence. He speaks of "all that precedes the building of the temple." Let us see what we can find.

There certainly is a plurality of lay altars. But side by side with them we find something else. As already pointed out, the first two chapters of Kings introduce us to a tent of the Lord with a horned altar. Wellhausen of course takes no notice of these passages for the purpose of his discussion. To those who have followed the preceding argument, it will be absolutely clear that no contemporary could for one moment have confused these with lay altars. This tent dated from David (2 Sam. vi. 17). For that period, therefore, we have a "house" side by side with the lay altars. The fact that it was of a professedly temporary nature cannot in any wise alter its essential character. Going back, we find in 1 Samuel xxi. that there was at Nob a priestly establishment. At first sight it would appear that this does not help us very much; but more careful consideration of the narrative proves that there must have been something in the nature of a house where the shewbread was kept (to say nothing of the ephod and spear), for shewbread has nothing to do with a lay altar,

nor could the expression "from before the LORD" (ver. 7 (6)) here apply to such an erection. The other data for this period are indecisive except in the case of Shiloh. It will be well to set out Wellhausen's remarks on this subject in parallel columns.

Page 19.

Toward the close of the period of the Judges, Shiloh appears to have acquired an importance that perhaps extended even beyond the limits of the tribe of Joseph. By a later age the temple there was even regarded as the prototype of the temple of Solomon, that is, as the one legitimate place of worship to which the LORD[1] had made a grant of all the burnt-offerings of the children of Israel (Jer. vii. 12; 1 Sam. ii. 27–36). But, in point of fact, if a prosperous man of Ephraim or Benjamin made a pilgrimage to the joyful festival at Shiloh at the turn of the year, the reason for his doing so was not that he could have had no opportunity at his home in Ramah or Gibeah for eating and drinking before the Lord. Any strict centralization is for that period inconceivable, alike in the religious as in every other sphere. This is seen even in the circumstance that the destruction of the temple of Shiloh, the priesthood of which we find officiating at Nob a little later, did not exercise the smallest modifying influence upon the character and position of the cultus; Shiloh disappears quietly from the scene, and is not mentioned again until we learn from Jeremiah that at least from the time when Solomon's temple was founded its temple lay in ruins.

Page 129.

An independent and influential priesthood could develop itself only at the larger and more public centres of worship, *but that of Shiloh seems to have been the only one of this class.* [My italics. H. M. W.] The remaining houses of God, of which we hear some word from the transition period which preceded the monarchy, are not of importance, and are in private hands, thus corresponding to that of Micah on Mount Ephraim.

[1] In accordance with my usual custom I substitute this for the transliteration of the Tetragrammaton.

It will be seen that Wellhausen in the second extract admits the exceptional position of Shiloh.[1] What he means by his argument about its destruction not modifying the cultus I do not know. Our information as to this period is quite fragmentary, and all we can say is that after the destruction of Shiloh the priesthood formed a religious center at Nob; but whether this attained to the same position as Shiloh it is impossible to say. It must be remembered that the period was one of great national calamity and disorganization; and the Law itself expressly recognizes secure peace as a condition precedent of regular religious pilgrimages (Ex. xxxiv. 24; cp. Deut. xii. 9). That the Philistine wars broke in on the previous practice is reasonably clear; and it is probable that religious centralization did not recover the ground lost at that time till the Ark was lodged at Jerusalem. In any case our survey teaches us that early history as well as the law recognizes a house of the Lord served by a hereditary priesthood which in normal peace times attracted pilgrims and held a position fundamentally different from that of the lay altars.[2]

One other point requires notice. We find the word *bamah* ("high place") in 1 Samuel ix. 12–25 and x. 5, 13; and it is sometimes inferred that this was contrary to the Law. But this is not so. A lay altar would not become unlawful unless it had some unlawful accessory (such as steps or an Asherah) or were used for some unlawful purpose. The mere name could not make it other than lawful. Indeed there is no

[1] On pages 131 f. he speaks of the establishment at Shiloh, and subsequently at Nob, as "the solitary instance of an independent and considerable priesthood to be met with in the old history of Israel."

[2] Gideon's ephod is expressly condemned in the narrative of Judges, so that no argument can be based on this passage. Micah's image (Jud. xvii. f.) was kept in his own house; so that we find no "house of God" there.

reason to read into such passages the associations of the bamoth of a later period or the bamoth of the Canaanites. In the days of Samuel the thing itself appears to have been entirely innocent in the only instances with which we meet. The Law raises no objection to the *word* bamah (which is not used in Deut. xii., though it appears in Lev. and Num.). Of the bamah in 1 Samuel x. we know too little, but chapter ix. gives us sufficient light. The sacrifice was accomplished by a layman, called the "cook" (literally slaughterer), without priestly assistance. Samuel himself was not present, and the meal was delayed till his arrival, not that he might perform any priestly rite, but that he might "bless the sacrifice." A banqueting-room was attached, but there are no signs of any heathen accessories. Nor can it be suggested that the sacrifice was to any but the God of Israel, or that Saul's visit was on one of the three pilgrimage festivals. Doubtless the altar was of a more permanent kind than that at Michmash; but, provided the materials and form were lawful, this makes no difference. This local sacrifice should be compared with the clan sacrifices already noticed. No doubt they were common all over the country. It must be remembered that Exodus xx. leaves the fullest latitude for customary lay sacrifice, and makes permanent lay altars as legal as those of a more temporary kind, provided that they conform to the prescriptions of the law. A very important point in connection with this bamah must be noticed further. We know from all our authorities — First Samuel not less than the Pentateuch — that in sacrifices performed with the assistance of priests, the burning of the fat was a specifically priestly function (1 Sam. ii. 16). Here Samuel's rôle is very different from that of a priest. He has nothing to do with the burning of the fat or the specifically sacrificial part of the sacrifice, but merely says

grace. This shows that the bâmah was not the center of an illegal priesthood, but a place of lay sacrifice. As such it was perfectly lawful.

The writer in Kings suggests that sacrifices offered at bamoth before the erection of the temple were barely lawful (1 Kings iii. 2-4). Perhaps this means that he had before him information about these bamoth which showed that there were unlawful accessories or that sacrifices were offered there which should have been taken to the religious capital in normal times. Thus it may well be that Solomon's visit to Gibeah was made on one of the festivals. Possibly, however, the comments are inspired by a view of the Law which was certainly taken in a later age, although legal science makes it certain that the original meaning was different. Finding the word bamah, the writer may have supposed that it denoted a high place with idolatrous adjuncts, such as those with which we often meet, or (more probably) he may have taken the late view that the Law prohibited all local altars.

Wellhausen distinguishes three stages in the law and the history — that of JE, the Deuteronomic, and that of P. With the first we have now dealt and we have found that law and history alike recognize one lawful House of the LORD and many lay altars. It will be found that precisely the same characteristics reassert themselves in the second.

Deuteronomy demands that certain offerings shall be brought to the religious capital which is to come into existence at a later time. But it also recognizes and regulates local altars in xvi. 21, a passage of which Dr. Driver writes (*ad loc.*) : "As Dillmann observes, it presupposes by its wording the law of Ex. xx. 24." Similarly Mr. Carpenter (*ad loc.*) admits that this law "belongs to the older cultus before the unity of the sanctuary was enforced in xii." When I ask a Well-

hausenite to show me any reference to this important verse in the Prolegomena I never get any answer. The index to Dr. Hastings's larger Bible Dictionary may also be consulted in vain for any sign of recognition that this passage exists. As is usual with the critical school, the whole of the relevant material has not been collected. This passage, too, is supported by the work of the "Deuteronomic redactor" in Joshua, who (viii. 30 ff.) makes Joshua erect a lay altar of the familiar type. Needless to say, Wellhausen never discusses this passage either. It is so easy to prove any theory — if only the facts are selected judiciously.

On the law, however, two small points remain.

1. Deuteronomy expressly permits non-sacrificial slaughter. How completely Wellhausen's explanation breaks down in the light of history we have already seen. But the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuchal legislation explains the provision fully. Non-sacrificial slaughter had been in use till the time when Leviticus xvii. 1–7 was enacted, for the reasons given in verses 5–7. This made it necessary to again legalize non-sacrificial slaughter on the eve of the entry into Canaan, save for persons living near the religious capital (Deut. xii. 21).[1]

2. More important is the question whether there is any antinomy between the provisions of Deuteronomy and those of the earlier books. We have seen that the early legislation recognizes a house of the Lord (with a horned altar) to which pilgrimages must be made, and also a plurality of

[1] A small point on the words "a statute for ever" in Leviticus xvii. 7 requires notice. This would most naturally refer only to the sentence immediately preceding (i.e. the prohibition of sacrificing to satyrs), but possibly should be extended to all slaughter by persons within a reasonable distance (Deut. xii. 21) of the religious center.

lay altars. Deuteronomy does the same in both respects, but it is alleged that there is a discrepancy between Exodus xx., which permits the sacrifice of burnt-offerings at local altars, and Deuteronomy xii. 13, 14. To explain this it is necessary to consider the historical background.

There are always two ways of construing any law. Either an isolated phrase may be wrested from the context and (certain expressions in it being emphasized) be made to bear a meaning foreign to the original intent, or else the law may be considered as a whole, regard being paid to the historical background and the manifest intent of the legislator, while individual expressions are construed in the light so afforded. If we really wish to understand Exodus and Deuteronomy we must in each case regard the legislation as a whole.

Exodus xx. is a law given with intent to guard the preëxisting custom of lay sacrifice from abuses. It is abundantly clear that it deals with lay altars only, and therefore that the only burnt-offerings to which it can refer are such as were customarily offered at lay altars. When it is remembered that the same legislation recognizes a house of the LORD to which pilgrimages were to be made on the three festivals, the question arises, Could or would a lay altar be used by a pilgrim on such an occasion? Exodus xxiii. 15 and xxxiv. 20 ("And none shall appear before me empty"), answer the question. The "appearance before God" at the House clearly does not mean an appearance at a casual stone or mound. It is an appearance at the House with the horned altar, and it is an appearance with sacrifices. Thus this legislation recognizes sacrifices which could be offered at the House and nowhere else. The same holds good of Exodus xxxiv. 25: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover

remain all night unto the morning." Seeing that passover was also one of the "appearances before the LORD," the matter cannot be doubtful. Anybody who wishes for a description of what actually occurred on such occasions need only read the first two chapters of First Samuel. Even when abuses had crept in, it never entered anybody's head that these sacrifices could be presented at a lay altar. And so we see the meaning of Exodus xx. Theoretically, if the passage stood alone, "thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings" might mean either "all thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings of whatever nature" or else "all such burnt-offerings and peace-offerings as thou mayest offer in accordance with the existing custom as to lay sacrifice, but not other burnt-offerings or peace-offerings which do not fall within this custom." But as the passage does not stand alone, we see that the first interpretation is erroneous and the second correct; or, to put the matter in another way, the law relates merely to customary, not to *statutory,* sacrifices.

Conversely it appears that Deuteronomy xii. deals with statutory, not customary, sacrifices. Hence the apparent antinomy. Really Exodus xx. and Deuteronomy xii. are treating of different things in a manner perfectly intelligible to contemporaries. But to untrained foreigners living in a widely different age, and in circumstances that present no resemblance to those of Hebrew antiquity, a few phrases present difficulties. I proceed to prove this in detail.

First, whatever non-lawyers may think, it is quite inconceivable that a legislator should recognize as lawful in chapter xvi. something that he had prohibited in chapter xii. Such a construction of the law is manifestly erroneous.

Secondly, Deuteronomy xii. never prohibits lay altars at all. If the introductory verses of the chapter be read, its whole

meaning becomes clear. The Israelites were about to enter a land in which there were numerous Canaanitish high places (not plain lay altars) with idolatrous accessories. They had ever been prone to apostacy (Num. xxv. 2; Lev. xvii.; Deut. xii. 8). Moses, not unnaturally, feared that they might be tempted to go to these places and there offer gifts that should be brought only to the House of the Lord. Probably his fears were rendered more acute by the existence among the Canaanites of sacrificial institutions closely resembling in most externals the statutory individual offerings he had introduced. Accordingly he vigorously denounces the "places upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree," and enjoins the destruction of such altars and their idolatrous accessories. What follows is directed to preventing such places from being used by Israelites. In so far as the ordinary common-law worship at lay altars was concerned, there was obviously no danger; but it was otherwise with the new statutory offerings introduced by the Mosaic legislation and with the food sacrifices of Leviticus xvii. It is to these, and these alone, that the chapter is addressed. Indeed, had this been headed (as might be the case in a modern statute) "Statutory Individual Offerings," while Exodus xx. was headed "Customary Lay Sacrifices," no difficulties could have arisen. Whatever the views of later generations, it is impossible to hold that the contemporaries of Moses could really have supposed this chapter to refer to the old lay sacrifices which they were in the habit of offering on many solemn or joyous occasions.

Once this is firmly grasped, all difficulties disappear. There is no antinomy between Deuteronomy xii. and xvi., because it is seen that the former deals with a different class of offerings from those contemplated by the latter. Another diffi-

culty — insuperable for a lawyer — that Deuteronomy xii. contains no prohibition of the previously legal lay altars which on the Wellhausen theory it was meant to abrogate — also vanishes. And, lastly, it becomes clear that there is no conflict between Deuteronomy xii. 13 f. and Exodus xx., since the former is concerned only with statutory burnt-offerings, while the latter merely contemplates customary burnt-offerings.

When it is understood that the legal provisions of JE and Deuteronomy are in perfect harmony, it follows that the practice of the age of Samuel conforms as well with one as with the other. Hence no detailed examination of the history is here necessary: yet two or three remarks may be made on Wellhausen's survey.

1. In considering the evidence of Elijah it is important to note that while he speaks of "thy altars" as being thrown down (1 Kings xix. 10, 14), this phrase is most naturally interpreted of such lay altars as that on Carmel which he had found in disrepair (1 Kings xviii. 30). The account of his proceedings shows clearly that we have to do here with an ordinary lay altar used more or less permanently, not with a "house of God" or a horned altar served by priests. Hence when we read Elijah's complaint it is natural to refer it to such altars as that on Carmel.

2. When Wellhausen speaks of Hezekiah's attempt to abolish other sanctuaries, he fails to notice that, according to 2 Kings xviii. 4, he appears to have left the lay altars. In verse 22 he is charged with having destroyed the altars of God, apparently all altars; but the contrast between verse 4 and verse 22 does not favor this view. Even Robertson Smith[1] writes: "A distinction between a high place and an altar is acknowledged in the Old Testament down to the close of the

[1] Religion of the Semites (2d Ed.), p. 490.

Kingdom (2 Kings xxiii. 15, Isa. xxxvi. 7)." If Hezekiah did leave the lay altars while destroying all the bamoth containing heathenish accessories, his action exactly corresponds with the sole view of the original meaning of the Law which is, legally speaking, possible.

With regard to Wellhausen's discussion of P, this depends mainly on his inability to discriminate between substantive law and procedure; and for the moment the consideration of this will be deferred in order to clear away certain minor points.

1. It is contended that Joshua xxii. proves that only a single altar is legal. This argument results from the confusion of lay altars and horned altars. The altar of the trans-Jordanic tribes was built after the pattern of the great altar of burnt-offering, and was therefore a horned altar. The protest against its erection proves nothing whatever with regard to lay altars.

2. Wellhausen writes of P: "Nowhere does it become apparent that the abolition of the Bamoth and Asherim and memorial stones is the real object contemplated; these institutions are now almost unknown, and what is really only intelligible as a negative and polemical ordinance is regarded as full of meaning in itself" (p. 36). The superficiality of Wellhausen's acquaintance with P must explain, though it cannot excuse, this misrepresentation. P is as definite and emphatic on the subject as the other parts of the legislation: "then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you, and *destroy all their figured stones, and destroy all their molten images, and demolish all their Bamoth*" (Num. xxxiii. 52 (P^s); compare Leviticus xxvi. 1, 30 (both P^h)). It is of course true that P contains no prohibition of such bamoth as Samuel's; but neither does JE or D, both of which, as we have seen, regard lay altars as lawful.

3. The indictment of the Mosaic altar and tent takes no account of the condition of the text of the concluding chapters of Exodus, or of the fact that, according to P itself, the tent was capable of transportation in six pair-ox wagons aided by porters.[1]

4. The discussion of the Mosaic altar of burnt-offering (p. 44) ignores the fact (noticed above) that either that altar or some other horned altar was to be found before the Ark at an earlier date than the erection of Solomon's temple.

Before passing to the second great confusion we must consider the various kinds of offerings somewhat further. We have seen very fully that law and history alike recognize at least two kinds of sacrifices: (1) customary offerings presented locally at a lay altar; and (2) statutory offerings which could be offered only at the religious center. But hitherto we have dealt purely with individual sacrifices. In point of fact, however, there are two kinds of statutory sacrifices — those offered by individuals, and those offered on behalf of the whole people. Thus we really have three classes: (1) customary (individual) offerings, (2) statutory individual offerings, (3) (statutory) national offerings. I adopt this terminology because I believe the words "public" and "private" to lend themselves too readily to confusion. "Private" is apt to obscure the distinction between customary individual offerings and statutory individual offerings: "public," that between statutory individual offerings and national offerings. Anybody who wishes to clear his mind on the point should read, e.g., Numbers xxviii. f., or the passage as to the shewbread in Leviticus xxiv. 5–9, or the requirement as to the sheaf in Leviticus xxiii. 10–14, and ask himself whether

[1] On the allegations as to the tent in E (p. 39), see *supra*, pp 93–102, with pp. 66–70, 91.

these were to be offered by or on behalf of any (and if so which) individual or on behalf of the whole nation.

Thus the sacrificial system contemplated by the Law is represented by the following table:—

Description.	Origin.	Whether individual or national.	By whom offered.	Where offered.
1. Customary lay offerings.	Pre-Mosaic, regulated but not abolished by Moses.	Individual.	Offered by laymen without priestly assistance.	At a local altar.
2. Statutory individual offerings.	Introduced by Moses.	Individual.	Offered by laymen with priestly assistance.	At the religious capital.
3. Statutory national offerings.	Introduced by Moses.	National.	Offered by the priests.	At the religious capital.

The resemblances and the differences alike offer numerous opportunities for blundering to those who have no grasp of the subject.

The national offerings which figure so largely in P are not mentioned in JE or D. It therefore becomes necessary to prove from the history that they in fact existed long before the Exile. Not unnaturally the references are scanty in number and incidental in character; yet they are sufficient to show the existence of these offerings. The better to deal with the higher critical case I quote the following statement from Dr. Gray's "Numbers." The source appears to be the note on page 79 of Wellhausen's Prolegomena.

"Before the Exile the daily offering consisted of a עולה [burnt-offering] in the morning and a מנחה [meal-offering] in the evening (2 K. xvi 15: cp. 1 K. xviii 29, 36). Ezekiel also requires *one* עולה and *one* מנחה (clearly a *meal-offering*) to be offered every day, but requires both to be offered in the morning. Neh. x 34 (33) still

speaks of a daily מנחה and a daily עולה: it does not specify the time of offering, and it is therefore uncertain whether in this respect it agreed with 2 K. xvi 15 or Ezek.; but in common with both of these it *co-ordinates* the עולה and מנחה. The present law (Nu. xxviii 3–8) requires *two* עולת daily, one in the morning and one in the evening, and also *two* מנחת; but the מנחה is in each case *subordinated* to the עולה."[1]

Now, first, it is true that 1 Kings xviii. 29, 36 speaks of the time of the offering of the meal-offering in terms that make it quite clear that the time meant was in the evening: but it is also true that 2 Kings iii. 20 (which the critics characteristically ignore) speaks of "in the morning, about the time of offering the meal-offering." Therefore there was also a meal-offering in the morning, at any rate during some part of the preëxilic period. Secondly, it is always a wise precaution to read the passages to which one refers. Second Kings xvi. 15 contains the following directions from Ahaz: "Upon the great altar burn the morning burnt-offering, and the evening meal-offering, and the king's burnt-offering, and his meal-offering, with the burnt-offering of all the people of the land, and their meal-offering, and their drink-offerings and sprinkle upon it all the blood of the burnt-offering," etc. Higher critical arithmetic is of course notoriously a little weak; but there is a general impression abroad that one and one make two, not one. The morning burnt-offering is one, the burnt-offering of all the people is also one: total, two. (The king's offering of course falls out of account for this purpose.) Moreover, "the burnt-offering of all the people, and their meal-offering, and their drink-offerings" looks very much as if we had to do with *subordinated* meal-offerings and drink-offerings. Curiously enough, too, even Numbers xxviii. 8, which subordinates meal-offerings, speaks of "the meal-offering of the morning," which is very much like 2 Kings iii. 20. It

[1] Gray, Numbers, p. 405

is therefore clear that in truth and in fact preëxilic practice did agree with this law. What does appear is the addition of a name, perhaps also a difference in the emphasis laid on the different offerings. So long as there were only two offerings of each sort, it was sufficient to speak of morning and evening. When a king's offering was added, apparently the name "burnt-offering of all the people of the land" was sometimes used to distinguish from it one of the other two. There is also nothing in this passage about one of the meal-offerings being offered in the morning; but, in view of 2 Kings iii. 20, this will not help the critics. It is of course possible that slight variations took place from time to time: indeed these directions of Ahaz prove that much. But there is clearly no substantial difference between the practice here and the law of P. The passage in Nehemiah does not affect our question either way: but Dr. Gray is right in saying that it "is not entirely free from obscurity."[1]

For our purposes it is important to note that the national offerings can be traced back to a period before the kingdom. The shewbread was a national offering. It is not mentioned in JE or D. Yet we see it at Nob. From this, two results follow: (1) at the earliest post-Mosaic times of which we have cognizance national offerings existed; (2) inasmuch as they existed long before the alleged dates of the composition of JE and D, and yet are not mentioned in those documents, no inference at all can be drawn from the silence of those documents on these or similar points. This is the answer to Wellhausen's argument on page 103: "Centralisation is synonymous with generalisation and fixity, and these are

[1] Dr. Gray makes a point of the quantities in Numbers xxviii. f. being fixed. This is due to the fact that we are dealing here with the *national* offerings, which in this as in other respects differed somewhat from individual offerings.

the external features by which the festivals of the Priestly Code are distinguished from those which preceded them. In evidence I point to the prescribed sacrifice of the community instead of the spontaneous sacrifice of the individual." [1] And the confusion appears even more distinctly on page 90, where we read of Deuteronomy: "Even here, however, we do not meet with one general festive offering on the part of the community, but only with isolated private offerings by individuals." As such general sacrifices are proved to have existed before the date to which Wellhausen assigns Deuteronomy, his reasoning is clearly valueless.

Before we can make much use of these distinctions for the destruction of Wellhausen's main case, we must proceed to notice the other great source of confusion — the ignorance of the distinction between substantive law and procedure. Using law in a wide sense to cover sacrificial as well as jural law, it will be seen that this is a natural distinction. If A enters into a contract with X that he shall sell him a book, the rights and duties of A and X under that contract will be governed by legal rules. If, however, X does not fulfil his duties, A may desire to have recourse to a court to enforce his right. From that moment the interest shifts from the question of what his right is to the question how that right is to be enforced. How is he to set about the business? By the issue of a writ? If so, how and when and by whom are writs issued? And so on. All these latter questions are questions of procedure. In jural law, procedure in litigation is the most important part of procedure: it is, however, not the only procedure. If I am owner of Whiteacre I have a right to sell it: but, in order to make a valid title for the purchaser, he and I must go through the appropriate procedure, e.g. executing

[1] The other arguments adduced by Wellhausen at this point will be refuted further on.

the necessary instrument or instruments for carrying out my intention. Similarly with sacrifice. A command that particular sacrifices shall be offered is substantive law. The method of offering and ancillary matters, such as the dues to be paid to the priests, etc., fall within the province of procedure.

In countries that have codified their law it is frequently the case that separate codes are devoted to procedure in litigation. Thus codes of civil procedure and criminal procedure will frequently be found by the side of codes of civil and criminal law. In the codes of procedure the emphasis naturally lies on methods of procedure. It is assumed that a duty is alleged to have been broken, and the rules deal with the steps to be taken in such a state of affairs. On the other hand, in the codes of substantive law the emphasis lies on the rights and duties of the parties, not on the remedies to be pursued in case of a breach of law. Such distinctions arise universally because they are inherent in the nature of the subject. They do not prove diversity of date or authorship.

A great part of Wellhausen's book rests on his ignorance of these fundamental considerations. We have seen that JE and D require Israelites to bring certain statutory individual offerings to the religious capital. The procedure to be followed in such cases is for the most part contained in P. That is the answer to such passages as the following:—

"But is it older or younger than Deuteronomy? In that book the unity of the cultus is *commanded;* in the Priestly Code it is *presupposed.* Everywhere it is tacitly assumed as a fundamental postulate, but nowhere does it find actual expression" (p. 35).

"An altogether disproportionate emphasis is accordingly laid upon the technique of sacrifice corresponding to the theory, alike upon the *when*, the *where*, and the *by whom*, and also in a very special manner upon the *how*" (p. 52).

Such are the characteristics of every code of procedure. For instance, the procedure for commencing actions in a given

court necessarily assumes that there will be persons who will conceive themselves to have good causes of action, and will accordingly invoke the jurisdiction of the court; and accordingly it will "presuppose" the existence of the court and of the cause of action and occupy itself with "the *when*, the *where*, the *by whom*, and the *how*," to the partial or total exclusion of all other topics. On the other hand, the code of substantive law will assume that such matters are dealt with in the code of procedure and will accordingly leave them out of account.

These then are the confusions that underlie Wellhausen's arguments about the relation of P to the other portions of the legislation. They are admirably illustrated in the following sentence as to J: "How one is to set about offering sacrifice is taken for granted as already known, and nowhere figures as an affair for the legislation, which, on the contrary, occupies itself with quite other things" (p. 53). Here we have two confusions: (1) in part, Wellhausen is thinking of customary lay sacrifice and confusing it with the statutory individual sacrifices; but (2) in part, also, he is falling into the error of expecting to find procedure dealt with in the wrong place. To make this quite clear it will be necessary to dwell on other considerations.

An Israelite presenting himself at the House of God which was controlled by a priesthood would necessarily have to conform to the instructions they might give him if he desired to offer. This is sufficiently obvious without argument. We have an interesting illustration in 1 Samuel ii., where the laity were forced to conform even to practices that they believed to be wrong.[1] In most cases, however, there would be

[1] To avoid interrupting the thread of the argument, the discrepancy alleged to exist between this passage and P will be discussed later on.

no conflict. The layman would be anxious to offer in the right way: the priest would be there to give him the necessary instructions. As the procedure relating to the statutory individual offerings was technical, and a knowledge of it could never be required save at the House of God, it was naturally relegated by Moses to that portion of his legislation which, as we shall see later, was to reach the people only through the teaching of the priests.

The fact that Moses introduced for the first time statutory individual offerings which could be performed only at the religious capital with the aid of priests made it necessary to define and regulate the respective rôles of sacrificant and priest; and accordingly we find such regulations in P.[1] This and the confusion between customary lay sacrifice and statutory individual sacrifice are responsible for Wellhausen's argument on page 54, where he says of J: "According to this representation of the matter, Moses left the procedure in sacrifice . . . . to be regulated by the traditional praxis." That is true of the first kind of sacrifice, and once the necessary distinction is drawn, no difficulty or inconsistency remains.

The clear distinction between substantive law and procedure makes it easy to dispose of Wellhausen's account of the festivals. On pages 99 f. Wellhausen alleges, with regard to the three pilgrimage festivals, that in P

"the festal celebration, properly so called, is exhausted by a prescribed joint offering. . . . The passover alone continues in the Priestly Code also to be a sacrificial meal, and participation therein to be restricted to the family or a limited society. But this last remnant of the old custom shows itself here as a peculiar exception; . . . .

"Of a piece with this is the circumstance that the 'first-fruits' of the season have come to be separated from the festivals still more

[1] It is not the case that the priest slaughters the animal sacrificed by an individual. On the contrary, the sacrificant performs this duty (Lev. i. 5, etc.).

than had been previously the case. While in Deuteronomy they are still offered at the three great sacrificial meals in the presence of the LORD, in the Priestly Code they have altogether ceased to be offerings at all, and thus also of course have ceased to be festal offerings, being merely dues payable to the priests (by whom they are in part collected) and not in any case brought before the altar. Thus the feasts entirely lose their peculiar characteristics, the occasions by which they are inspired and distinguished; by the monotonous sameness of the unvarying burnt-offering and sin-offering of the community as a whole they are all put on the same even level, deprived of their natural spontaneity, and degraded into mere 'exercises of religion.' Only some very slight traces continue to bear witness to, we might rather say, to betray, what was the point from which the development started, namely, the rites of the barley sheaf, the loaves of bread, and the booths (Lev. xxiii.). But these are mere rites, petrified remains of the old custom; the actual first-fruits belonging to the owners of the soil are collected by the priests, the shadow of them is retained at the festival in the form of the sheaf offered by the whole community — a piece of symbolism which has now become quite separated from its connection and is no longer understood. And since the giving of thanks for the fruits of the field has ceased to have any substantial place in the feasts, the very shadow of connection between the two also begins to disappear, for the rites of Lev. xxiii. are taken over from an older legislation, and for the most part are passed over in silence in Num. xxviii., xxix. Here, again, the passover has followed a path of its own. Even at an earlier period, substitution of other cattle and sheep was permitted. But now in the Priestly Code the firstlings are strictly demanded indeed, but merely as dues, not as sacrifices; the passover, always a yearling lamb or kid, has neither in fact nor in time anything to do with them, but occupies a separate position alongside."

I begin with Passover. The theory that in P the festival is celebrated in the house, and not before the Lord, rests on Wellhausen's habitual omission to examine the evidence. The statements relating to the second Passover (i.e. the first anniversary of the Passover in Egypt) leave no doubt on that head. In Numbers ix. 6–14 we read how certain men who were not in a state of sacrificial cleanness were unable to perform their statutory duties. The R. V. translation is here misleading, for "offer the oblation" (ver. 7 and 13) does not represent the original adequately. The Hebrew uses technical terms which

signify the presentation of sacrifices at the religious capital. Attendance at the religious capital is also implied by Exodus xii. 48 ("let him *come near*"); but from verse 46 it would seem that the actual meal was intended to take place in each family's temporary or permanent abode, though presumably the animal was killed at the religious center. This disposes of Wellhausen's argument (p. 102) that "the law relating to Easter is removed from all connection with the tabernacle legislation (Exod. xii. 1 seq.), and the difficulty that now in the case of the passover the sanctuary which elsewhere in the Priestly Code is indispensable must be left out of sight is got over by divesting it as much as possible of its sacrificial character." Yet in a note he says: "The ignoring of the sanctuary has a reason only in the case of the first passover, and perhaps ought to be regarded as holding good for that only." It will now be obvious that in point of fact, apart from the Passover in Egypt, the whole legislation — that of JE and P as well as D — contemplates an appearance at the House of the Lord on Passover.

Wellhausen further writes in this connection: "But now in the Priestly Code the firstlings are strictly demanded indeed, but merely as dues, not as sacrifices" (p. 100). That is not the case. In P the firstlings are "holy"; and P's rule as to "holy" things other than most holy things and wave-offerings is expressed in Numbers v. 9 f. This passage is very important; because it not merely explains the difficulties that have been felt as to firstlings, but clearly proves the large measure of spontaneity and free will attaching to the sacrificial system. "And every *terumah* [E.V. "heave-offering"] of all the holy things of the children of Israel, which they present unto the priest, shall be his. And every man's holy things shall be his: whatsoever any man giveth the priest, it shall be his." That

is to say, the Israelite consumed such holy things as were brought to the religious capital (e.g. firstlings) at a sacrificial feast. But of them he gave a *terumah* (consisting of such animals or amounts as he might choose) to the priest. The subsequent disposition of this *terumah* is regulated by Numbers xviii. It will be seen that there is no question of these firstlings and other holy things being "demanded as dues," or "collected by the priests."

The next event in the festal cycle is the presentation of the kind of first-fruits known as *reshith*.[1] The only date we have here is that of Leviticus xxiii. 10 f. It is true that this is assigned not to P but to P^h (or H if that notation be preferred); but seeing that P incorporated this in his work he must be taken to have agreed with the date.[2] Now P contains rules of procedure relating apparently to *individual* offerings of *reshith* (Lev. ii. 11–13) which shows that this legislation occupies precisely the same position as JE and D in this matter, for the presence of such offerings in P negatives the view that "the actual first-fruits are collected by the priests while the shadow of them is retained at the festival in the form of the sheaf, etc."

[1] On the true distinction between *reshith* and *bikkurim*, of which Welhausen knows nothing, see Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, *s. v.*, "First-fruits."

[2] Wellhausen writes of Deuteronomy xxvi. 1 ff.: "the prayer with which at the feast of tabernacles the share of the festal gifts falling to the priest is offered to the Deity" (p. 92). The theory that this offering refers to tabernacles is not merely groundless, but demonstrably wrong: (1) there is no evidence whatever to connect it with tabernacles; (2) this is an offering of *reshith*, and the only date given for this is that of Leviticus; (3) it lies in the nature of *reshith*, "the *first* of all the fruit of the ground," that it could not be offered at the end of the agricultural year. To be "first" it must be offered at "the time thou beginnest to put the sickle in the standing corn." Note that this prayer only applies to *reshith* of "the fruit of the ground," i.e. not to wine or oil.

Seven weeks after the presentation of *reshith* comes Pentecost. Here the same tale awaits us. Numbers xxviii. 26 actually refers to Pentecost as "the day of the *bikkurim*." It follows that it did not separate the first-fruits of the season from the festival. Leviticus ii. 14–16 undoubtedly deals with the procedure to be followed in the case of *individual* offerings of *bikkurim*. And this postulates as its necessary complement the command for individual Israelites to bring *bikkurim* to the House of the Lord (Ex. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26). Thus here again the view of P and JE is found to be identically the same. But, as usual, it is not P that gives us the primary and constituent enactment.

The third pilgrimage festival was tabernacles. On this Wellhausen writes:—

". . . . Alike at Jerusalem and at Bethel 'the feast' was celebrated from the days of Solomon and Jeroboam just as previously at Shechem and Shiloh, in the former place in September, in the latter perhaps somewhat later. This was at that period the sole actual *panegyris*. The feasts at the beginning of summer may indeed also have been observed at this early period (Isa. ix. 2), but in smaller local circles," etc. (pp. 94 f.).

This leaves out of account the notice that Solomon sacrificed three times in the year (1 Kings ix. 25). It can scarcely be that if he recognized tabernacles (as is admitted) this was not one of the three sacrifices. If so, a presumption arises that the other two occasions were the other two pilgrimage festivals; and this presumption is strengthened by the law of JE. Our knowledge of the religious observances during the whole of this period is so fragmentary that it is impossible to draw any inferences from the non-mention of particular festivals.

With regard to the connection of tabernacles and the particular offerings of the season, the matter is extremely simple. Tithes of wine, for example, could not be dealt with until after the vintage. Hence it follows from the nature of the case,

that they could be used for religious purposes only at tabernacles, and not before. Nature made impossible the alleged "dissociation" of the two.

I turn to deal with some smaller points.

Wellhausen writes:—

". . . . We may in like manner venture to regard it as a kind of refinement, though rather a refinement of idea, that the flesh of the sacrifice in the Priestly Code is no longer boiled, but consigned to the altar flames in its raw condition. Such was not the ancient custom, as is seen, not only from the case of Gideon already cited (Judges vi.), but also from the procedure at Shiloh, described in 1 Sam. ii., where the sons of Eli will not wait until the flesh of the sacrifice has been boiled, and the altar pieces burnt, but demand their share raw for roasting" (pp. 67 f.; cp. p. 62).

In 1 Samuel ii. 15–17 we read: "Yea, before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came, and said to the man that sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest; for he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw. And if the man said unto him, They will surely burn the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth; then he would say, Nay, but thou shalt give it me now: and if not, I will take it by force. And the sin of the young men was very great before the LORD," etc. (R. V.)

Now Leviticus iii. does not make it clear that the flesh of peace-offerings is to be boiled at all, still less when it is to be boiled; and accordingly it has been said that here we have early practice contradicting P. But while it is true that Leviticus iii. is silent on the point, yet, if it could be shown that the practice of boiling such sacrifices was so universal that P recognized it as certain to be done without specific directions, it would appear that the passage in Samuel does not prove what Wellhausen thinks it does. Such evidence is forthcoming. In Numbers vi. we have the law of the Nazirite who is to bring *inter alia* a peace-offering. Nothing is said about boiling the peace-offering, but this is assumed as self-evidently

necessary; for in verse 19 the law suddenly speaks of "the *sodden* shoulder of the ram." I do not infer from this that anything on the subject of boiling has fallen out of the text. The true inference is that in pre-Mosaic times the practice of boiling the meat of peace-offerings was universal. This was continued by Moses in the case of his statutory offerings without express mention — for no mention was necessary in dealing with a universal custom. Hence, where for some reason or other a departure from the usual practice was necessary, express directions are given; e.g. on the Passover in Egypt, where the animals were not ordinary peace-offerings. Similarly, at the consecration of Aaron, the boiling was, for some reason, to take place later. Otherwise no mention was necessary.[1] Similarly Leviticus vi. 21 (28) assumes the boiling of the sin-offering, and deals with the treatment of the receptacle in which it has been boiled. It will thus be seen that this passage of Samuel is unfavorable to the critical case.

It is said that P first fixed definite dates for the festivals.[2] Before its publication, tabernacles, for example, was celebrated in the autumn, but not on any particular date. This is disposed of by 1 Kings xii. 32 f.: "Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, *on the fifteenth day of the month*, like unto the feast that is in Judah. . . . And he went up . . . . *on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, even in the month which he had devised of his own heart.*" The *month* he had devised, but not the day, for the date of tabernacles — the date of P, and P alone of the Pentateuchal "codes" — is the fifteenth of the seventh month. Can it be doubted that there was a feast in Judah on the fifteenth day of a month that was not the eighth?

[1] Of course the express command to boil in Deuteronomy xvi. is probably due to the previous command as to the Passover in Egypt.

[2] Wellhausen, Prolegomena, p. 101.

This passage also disposes of another little critical argument. It is alleged that before the exile the months were not designated by numbers,[1] and indeed that, if they had been, Tishri, now the seventh month, would have been the first. Thus P betrays late date by numbering the months and by treating Tishri — the month of tabernacles — as the seventh month. Yet in this passage of Kings we hear of the eighth month by number, and it is sufficiently obvious that Jeroboam's choice was dictated by the fact that it was the month after the seventh. It cannot be argued that the month was really the second in the days of Jeroboam.

It may be well to expose a minor blunder of a singularly ludicrous type made by Wellhausen in connection with the festivals. As nearly all readers of Genesis i. are aware, the day began in the evening in ancient Israel. On page 104 we read in reference to the Priestly Code: "The passover, in the first month, on the evening of the 14th, here also indeed begins the feast, but does not, as in Deut. xvi. 4, 8, count as the first day of Easter week; on the contrary, the latter does not begin until the 15th and closes with the 21st (comp. Lev. xxiii. 6; Num. xxviii. 17; Exod. xii. 18)." It will be seen that Wellhausen admits that in P the passover falls on the evening of the 14th day, i.e. according to the Hebrew reckoning at the beginning of the 15th day ("and it was evening and it was morning"). Now Deuteronomy xvi. 6 provides for the sacrifice of the passover "at even, at the going down of the sun," and verse 4 speaks of "in the even, on the first day" as the time of the sacrifice. It seems obvious that Wellhausen wrote this, not heeding that this "even" would be the beginning and not the end of the first day. It does not "count as the first day of Easter week" but only as a portion of the first

[1] Wellhausen, Prolegomena, p. 109.

day: and nobody who has read Genesis i. will doubt that P reckoned days in the same way as D does here.[1]

Wellhausen's discussion of the new moon need not detain us. It is abundantly obvious that this was celebrated in early times. Doubtless it was pre-Mosaic; and it was therefore not necessary to enact its observance, as this already depended on the customary law. With regard to the Day of Atonement and sin-offerings it is sufficient to refer to what I have said in the *Princeton Theological Review* for April, 1907. A refutation of other points will be found in my "Studies in Biblical Law." The melancholy and disastrous blunders that we have already analyzed necessarily affect Wellhausen's point of view throughout, and, in combination with a documentary theory that is demonstrably untenable,[2] compel him to take perverse views of many minor points. It may, however, be worth while to correct one of these as a sample.

On pages 68 and 69 Wellhausen alleges that leavened cakes "seem originally by no means to have been considered unfit to be offered as in Lev. ii. 11. For under this law of Lev. ii. even the presentation of the shewbread would be inexplicable." This particular misrepresentation appears to be due to Wellhausen's omission to read this and the following verse; for the reason given is that fire offerings of leaven were not to be *burnt:* if offered, leaven was to be presented as *reshith,* and not to be burnt at the altar. Of course the shewbread was not to be burnt either.

[1] In a footnote on the next page (105) Wellhausen actually argues against this by saying *inter alia* that "the first day of the feast in Deuteronomy is just the day on the evening of which the passover is held, and upon it there follow not seven but six days more." Yet Deuteronomy xvi. 3 clearly makes the *seven* days of eating unleavened bread *begin* with the Passover sacrifice.

[2] See Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, *supra,* pp. 1–174, and the Expository Times, July, 1909, pp. 473–475, September, 1909, p. 563.

I turn to a more important matter.

The critical case is that P is a post-exilic forgery, though it may embody a good deal of earlier material. The irreducible minimum of the historico-legal case is that the legislation at any rate is (subject only to the ordinary vicissitudes of MS. tradition, which do not affect the point at issue) Mosaic, i.e. that we have in it the laws of Moses in the language of Moses. Now on the critical side it is usual, after making a number of admissions as to apparent references in the literature, to say that such references are insufficient to prove the *literary* use of P. But this argument ignores the express statements of the Pentateuch, including P, which make it clear beyond all possibility of doubt that the portions of the legislation embraced in P were for the most part not intended for general use: "They shall *teach* Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law" (Deut. xxxiii. 10, older poem included in E); "Take heed in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall *teach* you: as I commanded them, so ye shall observe to do" (Deut. xxiv. 8 (D)). These passages are tantamount to direct statements that there were certain teachings which were not intended to be generally current, but were intrusted to the Levites. So too P: "and to *teach* the children of Israel all the statutes which the LORD hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses" (Lev. x. 11; cp. xiv. 54–57; xv. 31–33, etc.). The contents of much of the legislation confirm this. It must be obvious that the details about leprosy, sacrificial procedure, priestly duties, etc., are too complicated and technical, and also had too little bearing on the everyday tasks of the ordinary Israelite, for it to have been possible to put them into operation without the assistance of a specially trained class. It follows that no argument about *literary* use could be decisive on the question of

the date and authorship of this legislation. Further, when Wellhausen speaks of P as "a law-book intended for the whole community" (p. 53), he merely contradicts all the data of P itself. Given the fact that large portions of P are professedly not intended for direct general use, and that other large portions are connected with these by similarity of style and material, it is not difficult to see the reasons for the peculiar phenomena of this legislation. Leaving out of account minor divisions, three main groups of laws are to be distinguished in the Pentateuch. First, there is law designed, as appears from its style, to be memorized. Secondly, we have Deuteronomy, the bulk of which was delivered in the first instance in the form of speeches. This was intended for septennial reading to the whole people, and style and contents are for the most part colored by these facts. Thirdly, we have the bulk of P — matters of procedure at the religious capital, details relating to the organization of the priestly tribe, matters in which the assistance of a specially trained class would have to be invoked.

All this presents not the slightest difficulty;[1] but in view of some of the arguments used it may be well to explain one or two points shortly.

The charge of the calendar is a technical duty which fell to the priesthood in ancient Rome as well as in ancient Israel. Hence it is easy to see why elaborate dates are given in the portions referred to P, while in the legislation intended for general currency more summary and popular methods were adopted. Further, the object alike in Exodus and Deuteronomy excludes the idea of a full calendar. Exodus gives merely a terse summary of the principal new Mosaic festivals,

[1] See especially the Princeton Theological Review, April and October, 1907.

etc., that affected the life of the ordinary peasant. He would learn details of date from the priesthood. Deuteronomy is concerned with the creation and use of a religious capital, and therefore emphasizes this aspect of the pilgrimage festivals.

The other point is more important. Great stress is laid on prophetic denunciations of sacrifice, and it is said that the priestly teachings known to the prophets were concerned with righteousness rather than ritual. In weighing such arguments it is necessary to bear in mind some of the matters we have already considered. It has been pointed out that much of P is mere procedure; and, assuming that the various sacrifices at the temple were performed in a manner substantially agreeing with its requirements, there is really no reason why the prophets should have thundered on the subject.[1] So too with other provisions. We know from Deuteronomy that there were teachings relating to leprosy: yet the prophets never denounce the priestly teaching on the ground that it fails to deal with this matter, which *ex hypothesi* was known in the time of, say, Jeremiah. Further, it is possible to force on the words of the prophets a meaning that was never intended. For example, Jeremiah says: "For I said nought unto your fathers, and commanded them nought, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices" (vii. 22). If this is to be pressed in its most literal meaning, we must infer that Jeremiah was unacquainted with the laws of Deuteronomy and JE, for these contain such commands. No man with a balanced mind would hesitate to use such language if no grave scandals were connected with the sacrificial procedure of his day. But there is another aspect to the mat-

[1] Cp., however, Zephaniah iii. 4: "her priests have profaned the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law." This may possibly refer to something in connection with ritual.

ter. According to the Jewish rabbis the most important chapter of the Pentateuch is Leviticus xix. Anybody who will be at the pains of reading that passage will see why it has obtained this distinction. That chapter belongs to P^h and is incorporated in P. It is clear from the superscription and the form that it was meant to be known to the whole people. If we may assume that this and kindred passages were intended to be taught by the priests to all and sundry, the expressions of the prophets become easily intelligible.

One thing more. In a footnote on page 59, Wellhausen writes:—

> "That the priests were not mere teachers of law and morals, but also gave ritual instruction (*e.g.*, regarding cleanness and uncleanness), is of course not denied by this. All that is asserted is that in pre-exilian antiquity the priests' own praxis (at the altar) never constituted the contents of the Torah, but that their Torah always consisted of instructions to the laity."

What he has failed to see is that there would be no object in teaching the laity the praxis of the priests at the altar, and also that we have absolutely no information as to whether the rules governing their practice were or were not included in their "torah." On the first point our only information is afforded by the passage of Samuel where we hear of the sin of Eli's sons. That is not sufficient to ground any theory. No doubt in ordinary cases the priest performed his task correctly, and was thought to do so by laymen. The second point is equally important. Our historical information as to the priestly teaching is entirely derived from cases where it came into contact with the life of the people. It follows, of necessity, that we cannot say from the scanty notices in history and prophecy what doctrines may have regulated the practice of the priests in their own ritual functions. Matters internal to the priesthood were not originally intended for general publication, nor did they concern the subjects which

form the themes of the prophets. On examination, the whole of this critical argument is found to be valueless. The conduct of Ezra in reading sections of the law (other than Deuteronomy) to the whole people proceeds from a fundamentally different theory from that expressed in the Law itself. The bulk of P was professedly only intended to reach the people mediately — through the teaching of the priests; and Ezra's innovation was in direct conflict with the original intention of the legislation.

The whole of the preceding inquiry may be summed up shortly in the following statement: From the days of Moses onwards there was a triple system of sacrifice — customary individual offerings, statutory individual offerings, statutory national offerings. The failure to recognize this has been the source of endless trouble. Combined with a complete disregard of the most elementary canons of scientific research, a constant tendency to pit verse against verse without ever considering the legislation as a unity, and an extraordinary capacity for making blunders in the minutiæ of legal and historical research, it has enabled Wellhausen to put forward a reconstruction of the history which will not bear investigation on a single point. On the other hand, some slight coloring has been lent to the theory by certain facts which, when more closely examined, are seen not to support it. It turns out that P was not in common literary use before Ezra, but also that P was never intended for common literary use: and its subsequent influence on the literature merely shows that a late age misunderstood the Mosaic provisions. Similarly Deuteronomy was interpreted as forbidding all sacrifice save at Jerusalem; though when its provisions are carefully scrutinized it appears that they bear no such meaning. The influence of Deuteronomy on the literature finds its natural explanation in

the narrative of the rediscovery of the book of the Law in the reign of Josiah, but this proves nothing as to date or authorship.

A strange new argument has lately been put forward in favor of the Wellhausen theory by Professor Nöldeke.[1] He says with great truth that the Pentateuch recognizes only one temple. But the Elephantine papyri have shown us a Jewish community in Egypt, which in the year 405 B.C., without being schismatic, considered itself entitled to a local temple. Bible students and jurists will be equally shocked at Professor Nöldeke's exhaustive ignorance, though for different reasons. Bible students will wonder that a man in the professor's position should ignore all the passages in J, E, D, and the historical books which prove the absurdity of this argument. As we have already discussed the topic at length, we need not now labor it. Jurists will shrug their shoulders over a man who presumes to write on the history of a law-book when he is so *naïf* as not even to know that thousands and thousands of times has human ingenuity run a coach and four through existing laws. His reasoning would prove that the Jews of to-day either do not know the Pentateuch or else do not regard it as binding.

As the argument has been advanced, it may be well to explain the causes that lie behind the particular phenomenon revealed by the papyri.

In the earliest period of which we have knowledge, the Hebrews worshiped God by prayer and by sacrifice. The former means is often overlooked; but there never was a time when religious men were unable to commune with a higher Power by the direct appeal of the heart, whether made silently or voiced in speech. The prayers of Moses, of Abra-

[1] Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, January, 1908, p. 203.

ham's servant, and of the patriarchs readily occur to the mind and set the matter beyond all reasonable doubt.

But, in addition to prayer, sacrifice was in use as a means of worship. All joint worship was sacrificial. The conception of the house of public prayer and public prayer alone — the synagogue — had not yet entered men's minds: and it must be obvious to all who read the early books of the Bible that such a house would not have corresponded to the religious needs of the age, even if it had been invented. Piecing together the available knowledge, we may perhaps hold that sacrifice was offered at certain stated times, such as new moon, as well as on many solemn or joyous occasions of chance occurrence. Then came the Exodus; and from that time onwards we find a peculiar view expressed most definitely, viz. that the God of Israel could only be worshiped sacrificially in the national territory. It may be that this view was not altogether novel, but we have no sufficient materials to enable us to decide that question. Certain it is that the view predominates throughout the Mosaic legislation to such an extent that no alternative is even considered. The legislation — the whole legislation — postulates the approaching occupation of national territory. Here are some of the expressions used: "These are the statutes and the judgments, which ye shall observe to do *in the land,* which the LORD . . . hath given thee to possess it" (Deut. xii. 1); "In all the place where I record My Name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee" (Ex. xx. 24); "Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord GOD, the God of Israel . . . neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou goest up to appear before the LORD thy God three times in the year" (Ex. xxxiv. 23 f.). Always and invariably the legislation is for a people that will possess and be settled in the national

territory, and nowhere else.[1] No provision whatever is made for the possibility that an Israelite may sojourn definitively in any land but his own. The only case contemplated (apart from national exile) is a brief absence: and that is dealt with in a section which with unconscious irony the critics assign to the post-exilic P. It is enacted that if an Israelite be "on a journey afar off" at the date of Passover, he is to keep it one month later (Num. ix. 10). With regard to the other pilgrimage festivals, and the sacrificial worship which, as we know from the historical books, was offered on sundry occasions, no provision whatever is made for the case of even a temporary absence — far less for permanent residence in a foreign land at such a distance from the religious capital as would make even the pilgrimages altogether impossible. *A fortiori,* the legislation never contemplates a period in which the nation should possess no territory at all and should yet sacrifice to its God.

The passages in the speeches of Deuteronomy where it is said that the Israelites in captivity will serve "other gods" (iv. 28; xxviii. 36, 64) may be mere prophecies of apostacy, and in any case scarcely assist our present inquiry. It is inconceivable that a Jeremiah or an Ezekiel should have approved of the worship of other gods by Jews in exile, though the former prophet contemplates this result as certain to follow (Jer. xvi. 13).

In the age succeeding Moses the matter therefore stood thus: The Israelites required sacrificial worship, and could not even conceive a form of religion which should exist entirely

[1] This is alone sufficient to dispose of the whole theory of an exilic or post-exilic P. That legislation given to a people whose center of gravity was in Babylonia should make no provision for an absence from Canaan exceeding a month or two in duration is a proposition which could be adopted only by men who have not the least practical acquaintance with the working of institutions.

without sacrifice. They were in the habit of meeting this need partly by local sacrifices and partly by pilgrimages to the religious center. Both methods were legal within certain limits. But no method existed whereby an Israelite might lawfully sacrifice to the God of Israel save in the national territory, nor was such a sacrifice even considered possible. It must be noticed that as yet no practical problem had arisen as a consequence of this state of affairs, for all those who worshiped Israel's God resided normally and permanently within Israel's territory.

Our first information as to the state of affairs that might arise in the case of an Israelite who was resident outside the national territory is afforded by a remark of David's: "They have driven me out this day that I should not cleave unto the inheritance of the LORD, saying, Go, serve other gods" (1 Sam. xxvi. 19). Consideration of this passage brings out two points: David's interlocutors do not even contemplate the possibility of his ceasing to sacrifice. He will infallibly serve some god or other. Life without sacrificial worship is inconceivable. And it is equally inconceivable that this sacrifice could be paid to the LORD outside His inheritance. A Samuel or an Elijah would probably not have concurred in either branch of the popular opinion: but for the purposes of tracing the history of the interpretation of the Law we must leave out of account the possible views of an enlightened minority.

The next stage is that marked by Naaman, who asks for Israelitish earth in order that he may sacrifice to Israel's God when residing in Syria. Here we see the first definite attempt to grapple with the difficulty which must necessarily arise when a worshiper of Israel's God desires to worship Him by means of some overt act outside Canaan. But as yet it is the solution of an individual, and it is based on a legal fiction.

Hosea speaking before the destruction of the Northern kingdom is our next witness: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without ephod or teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king" (iii. 4 f.). The passage has given rise to many disputes. To the present writer it appears that Hosea condemned all the institutions specified, regarding the Northern kingdom and its cult with disfavor while treating the line of David as alone legitimate. But one thing will be generally admitted, even by those who do not concur in this view. Hosea does not contemplate the possibility of offering sacrifices of the same kind outside the national territory as within it. Whether he contemplates any sacrifice as possible abroad must depend on the view taken of ix. 3 and 4: "They shall not dwell in the LORD's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean food in Assyria. They shall not pour out wine to the LORD, neither shall they be pleasing unto him: their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners; all that eat thereof shall be polluted: for their bread shall be for their appetite; it shall not come into the house of the LORD." This may be interpreted to mean either that they will offer no sacrifice at all, or else that they will purport to sacrifice, but that their sacrifice, at any rate in some cases, will not be efficacious because it is not offered in God's land. And then he asks in the next verse a question that is obviously unanswerable: "What will ye do in the day of solemn assembly, and in the day of the feast of the LORD?" That question goes to the root of the matter. It shows that as yet the problem of maintaining the national worship outside the national territory had found no adequate solution. The position is still substantially that postulated by the Mosaic

legislation — sacrificial worship to the national God on the national territory, and not elsewhere.[1] We pass next to Isaiah. It is unnecessary to transcribe the famous passage of the nineteenth chapter in which the prophet foretells the knowledge of God by the Egyptians and the joint worship of Egypt and Assyria. The horizons are widening; and it is impossible to say whether Isaiah would have clung to the old rule that sacrificial worship could be offered only in Canaan, had some colony of Jews living far off asked his advice. At the same time this chapter does not directly answer our question. It is a vision of what is to happen at some future date, not an expression of opinion as to what is legitimate in the present. Jeremiah, on the other hand, foretells that in exile the Israelites "shall serve other gods day and night; for I will show you no favor" (xvi. 13).

At this point our information fails us altogether. No further light is thrown by the contemporary prophets on the problems of worship in foreign lands. Yet the exiles must have found one or more solutions. Two questions confronted them: (1) How was the ordinary local worship to be maintained or replaced? (2) "What will ye do in the day of solemn assembly, and in the day of the feast of the Lord?" The solution ultimately adopted by Judaism is familiar to all. The synagogue was invented, and a service of prayer replaced all the old sacrifices: but such a solution could not have been adopted until the course of history had prepared the ground for it. It is not clear that such a course would have been any more conceivable to the contemporaries of Jeremiah than it was to Hosea. Nor can any appeal be made to the Law: for

[1] The only real modification that had been introduced into the Mosaic system was that made by Jeroboam in deference to political exigencies (1 Kings xii. 26 ff.); but this did not touch the problem of sacrifice abroad.

it never contemplates the public worship of God in the circumstances of the exile. Contemplating an entirely different set of conditions, it could, like any other law, be made to bear whatever interpretation was most in harmony with the needs of the age. It must be remembered that every law that is unalterable invariably leads to devices that enable men to change or repeal it while professing to maintain it intact. Some of these have been discussed by Sir Henry Maine;[1] and it is obvious that so far back as the time of Elisha, Naaman was as good at practising legal fictions as any lawyer of any country or age. When the exile made the most fundamental change possible in the conditions contemplated by the Law, three courses only were possible: (1) to abandon the public worship of Israel's God altogether; (2) to adopt a purely non-sacrificial worship; or (3) to adapt the sacrificial service to the changed needs of the age. The first solution, though perhaps contemplated by Jeremiah,[2] was out of the question, if Judaism was to be saved; the second had not yet occurred to men's minds and would not yet have satisfied their wants: the papyri prove that the third found favor for some time, at any rate in one place. That was how for a while men answered Hosea's question "What will ye do in the day of solemn assembly and in the day of the feast of the Lord?"

[1] See his Ancient Law.

[2] Jeremiah's words might, however, mean that the worship of the gods was additional or subsequent to an attempt to serve the God of Israel abroad.

INDEX I.

PRINCIPAL PASSAGES REFERRED TO

GENESIS

i. 1–iii. 24 28
ii.–iii. 40
ii. 4–iii. 24 28
ii. 4 13, 21, 26, 28
ii. 5 26
ii. 7 26
ii. 8 26
ii. 9 29
ii. 15 29
ii. 16 29
ii. 18 29, 36
ii. 19 29
ii. 21 29, 36
ii. 22 15, 29, 36
iii. 1 6, 8, 15, 26, 36
iii. 3 8
iii. 5 8
iii. 8 29, 30
iii. 9 29
iii. 13 29
iii. 14 29
iii. 21 29
iii. 22 15, 26, 36
iii. 23 26, 36
iv. 1 16, 17, 31
iv. 3 31
iv. 4 31
iv. 9 31
iv. 16 31
iv. 25 8
iv. 26 5, 8, 16, 186
v. 22 36
v. 29 9
vi. 5 36
vi. 6 31
vi. 7 31
vi. 9–xi. 17 38
vi. 11 38
vi. 12 38
vi. 13 36, 38
vi. 22 38
vii. 1 14, 36, 39
vii. 5 39
vii. 9 8, 13, 14, 36, 39
vii. 16 37, 39
viii. 15 14, 39
viii. 20 31, 39
viii. 21 13, 39
ix. 43
ix. 1 39
ix. 8 39
ix. 12 13, 39
ix. 16 32
ix. 17 39
ix. 27 8
x. 19 42, 43
xii. 8 5, 186
xii. 11 62
xii. 17 32
xiii. 4 5
xiii. 10 32, 43
xiii. 13 32
xiii. 14 32
xiii. 18 5, 186
xiv. 18 173 *n.*
xiv. 22 5, 18, 32
xv. 1 7
xv. 2 7, 18, 32, 37
xv. 4 32
xv. 6 32
xv. 7 5, 32, 41, 45, 46
xv. 8 37
xv. 18 33
xvi. 1 9
xvi. 2 5, 9
xvi. 5 33
xvi. 11 14, 17, 23 *n.*, 33
xvii. 40
xvii. 1 5, 7, 40
xvii. 15 37, 40
xvii. 18 40
xvii. 19 40
xviii. 1 33
xviii. 7 176
xviii. 14 5, 33, 45
xviii. 19 45
xviii. 33 37
xix. 2 23 *n.*
xix. 13 5
xix. 17–19 66
xix. 29 9, 33, 37, 40
xx. 18 9, 33

xxi. 1 7
xxi. 2 34, 40
xxi. 4 34, 40
xxi. 17 34
xxi. 33 5
xxii. 11 7, 9
xxii. 14–18 9
xxii. 15 37 *n.*
xxii. 16 45
xxiii. 40
xxiv. 31 5
xxv. 21 34
xxvi. 24 8, 45
xxvi. 28 6
xxvii. 7 7
xxvii. 9–14 176
xxvii. 14 185
xxviii. 4 37, 40
xxviii. 13 5, 19, 34, 42, 45 f.
xxviii. 21 9
xxx. 22 37
xxx. 24 16, 17, 34
xxx. 27 17, 34
xxxi. 3 9
xxxi. 5 9
xxxi. 7 37 *n.*
xxxi. 9 37 *n.*
xxxi. 16 38 *n.*
xxxi. 23 136
xxxi. 42 18, 34
xxxi. 49 34
xxxi. 53 15, 19, 34
xxxi. 54 186
xxxii. 29 (28) [1] 6, 8
xxxii. 30 (29) 9, 52
xxxii. 31 (30) 9
xxxiii. 5 6, 8
xxxiii. 10 8
xxxiii. 11 6, 8
xxxiii. 20 186
xxxiv. 25 43, 44
xxxv. 9 35, 37
xxxv. 10 37, 40
xxxv. 11 5
xxxviii. 7 35
xxxviii. 10 35
xxxix. 3 6
xxxix. 9 8
xliii. 16 176
xliii. 23 6, 8
xliii. 29 6, 8
xliv. 16 6, 8
xlv. 5 38 *n.*
xlv. 7 38 *n.*
xlv. 9 6, 8
xlv. 10 57 ff.
xlv. 18 57
xlvi. 28 57 f.
xlvii. 11 57
xlvii. 27 57 f.
xlviii. 2 62 f.
xlviii. 15 8, 18, 35
xlix. 18 6 *n.*
l. 24 6, 8

[1] Inadvertently printed on page 8 as xxx. 29 (28).

Exodus

i. 7 161
i. 9 159
i. 15 ff. 160
i. 20 159
ii. 61
ii. 15 f. 60
ii. 16 60
ii. 21 f. 60
iii. 55, 56
iii. 1 19, 35, 60, 61
iii. 4 15, 35
iii. 6 55
iii. 8 159
iii. 12 35, 55, 60, 64, 65
iii. 14 52
iii. 15 53
iii. 16 53
iii. 18 53, 64
iii. 19 f. 58 *n.*
iii. 19 79
iii. 21, 22 58 f.
iii. 22 57
iv. 1–3 71
iv. 2 f. 71
iv. 11 56
iv. 13–16 65
iv. 17 70, 71, 74 f.
iv. 18 f. 60
iv. 20 60, 61, 70, 71
iv. 24–26 61 f.
iv. 25 61, 63
iv. 26 63
iv. 30 71
v. 1 64, 65
v. 3 64
v. 4 64
v. 5 159
v. 17 14
v. 20 64
vi. 2–8 4, 5, 53, 54, 55, 56

vi. 2 15
vi. 3 7, 41 f., 44, 51
vii. 1 f. 73
vii. 2–7 64, 65
vii. 8–xi. 10 73, 79 ff.
vii. 8–13 70, 73
vii. 8–12 73
vii. 8 f. 66
vii. 8 59, 79
vii. 9 73
vii. 14–25 72
vii. 14 75
vii. 15 71, 75
vii. 16 64
vii. 17 77
vii. 19, 20 73
vii. 19 77
vii. 20 70, 74
vii. 22 73
vii. 25 75
vii. 26–viii. 11 (viii. 1–15) 72
vii. 26 (viii. 1) 64
viii. 1–3 (5–7) 73
viii. 4 (8) 64, 65
viii. 5 (9) 65
viii. 8 (12) 64, 65
viii. 11 (15) 73
viii. 12–15 (16–19) 72, 73
viii. 16–28 (20–32) 72
viii. 16 (20) 64
viii. 18 (22) 57, 59
viii. 21 (25) 64, 65
viii. 22 (26) 57 f.
viii. 23 (27) 64
viii. 24 (28) 65
viii. 25 (29) 65
ix. 1–7 72
ix. 1 f. 64
ix. 6 76
ix. 8–12 72, 73, 74
ix. 13–35 72
ix. 13 64
ix. 19 76
ix. 22 74, 76
ix. 23 70, 74
ix. 25 76
ix. 26 57, 59
ix. 27 64, 65
ix. 28 64
ix. 29 74
ix. 33 65, 74
x. 1–20 72
x. 3 64
x. 7 65
x. 8 64
x. 11 64
x. 12 74
x. 13 70, 74
x. 16 64, 65
x. 17 65
x. 18 65
x. 21–27 72
x. 21–23 59, 75
x. 21 74
x. 22 74
x. 28 f. 75
xi. 2 f. 59
xi. 2 57
xi. 5 76
xi. 10 73
xii. 1 f. 208
xii. 13 57
xii. 21–27 59
xii. 29 76
xii. 31 64
xii. 37 158, 160
xii. 48 208
xiii. 3–16 81
xiii. 13 184 *n.*
xiii. 17 82
xiii. 21 82 f., 88
xiii. 22 83, 106
xiv. 7 160
xiv. 19 f. 83
xiv. 20 84
xv. 94
xv. 25, 26 103
xv. 27 160
xvi. 103, 109
xvi. 1 94
xvi. 2–36 95
xvi. 4 103, 109
xvi. 6–10 85
xvi. 6–8 90 *n.*
xvi. 7 90 *n.*
xvi. 9–12 90 *n.*
xvi. 9 84
xvi. 10 84, 85, 90 *n.*
xvi. 11 f. 103
xvi. 15–30 104
xvi. 15 103 f.
xvi. 31 103 f.
xvi. 32 104
xvi. 33 f. 84
xvi. 33 86
xvi. 34 84
xvii. 94, 104, 106
xvii. 5, 6 105
xvii. 8–16 105 f.
xvii. 8 106

xviii. 98, 106, 160
xviii. 1 60
xviii. 2 ff. 63
xviii. 2–4 61
xviii. 2 60
xviii. 5 f. 60, 62
xviii. 5 98
xviii. 6 62 f.
xviii. 7 62
xviii. 9 60
xviii. 10 60
xviii. 13 99
xviii. 14 99
xviii. 16 98
xix. 9 87, 88 f.
xix. 16 87, 88 f.
xix. 24 107
xix. 25 107
xx. 21 87
xx. 24–26 180, 183 f., 191, 194 f., 197
xx. 24 175, 184 ff., 192, 221
xx. 26 180 *n.*
xxi. 6 187 *n.*
xxi. 14 184
xxi. 37 (xxii. 1) 176, 185
xxii. 8 (9) 187 *n.*
xxii. 29 (30) 184 *n.*
xxiii. 15 194
xxiii. 17 160
xxiii. 19 183 f., 210
xxiii. 20 f. 48
xxiii. 29 f. 160
xxiv. 1 96 *n.*
xxiv. 14 106
xxiv. 15 87
xxv.–xxx. 93
xxv. 3 163
xxv. 22 100, 107
xxvii. 181
xxviii. 42 f. 180 *n.*
xxix. 43 90
xxx. 11–16 164
xxx. 16 154 *n.*
xxxii–xxxiv. 110, 148, 149
xxxii. 1 ff. 148
xxxii. 11–13 149
xxxii. 14 151
xxxii. 20 151
xxxii. 25–29 107 f.
xxxii. 28 160
xxxii. 30–34 108
xxxii. 31 f. 149
xxxii. 31 148, 151
xxxii. 35 107 f.
xxxiii. 3 111
xxxiii. 6 108
xxxiii. 7–11 83 *n.*, 89 *n.*, 91, 93, 94, 106 f.
xxxiii. 7 f. 82, 93, 94
xxxiii. 7 66, 69, 97, 99
xxxiii. 8 ff. 99
xxxiii. 9 87
xxxiii. 11 65, 66, 69, 105
xxxiii. 12–23 108 f.
xxxiii. 12 108, 111
xxxiii. 18 90
xxxiii. 22 90
xxxiv. 1–4 152
xxxiv. 4 148
xxxiv. 5 87
xxxiv. 6–9 108
xxxiv. 9 149
xxxiv. 20 194
xxxiv. 22 183
xxxiv. 23 f. 160, 221
xxxiv. 23 183
xxxiv. 24 190
xxxiv. 25 194 f.
xxxiv. 26 183 f., 210
xxxiv. 28 148, 149, 152
xxxiv. 29 f. 160
xxxv.–xl. 93, 153
xxxv. 22–24 163
xxxvi. 163
xxxvi. 2 f. 152
xxxvii. 1 152
xxxviii. 24–31 163
xxxviii. 25 f. 161, 163
xl. 20 ff. 93
xl. 34 ff. 82, 84
xl. 34 87

LEVITICUS

i. 5 206 *n.*
ii. 11–13 209
ii. 11 214
ii. 14–16 210
iii. 211
vi. 21 (28) 212
vii. 22–27 177
viii. 4 161
x. 11 215
xiv. 54–57 215
xv. 31–33 215
xvi. 2 89, 101
xvii. 177, 196
xvii. 1–7 193
xvii. 7 193 *n.*
xviii. 21 48

xix. 218
xix. 12 48
xx. 3 48
xxi. 6 48
xxi. 14 99 *n.*
xxiii. 207
xxiii. 10–14 199 f.
xxiii. 10 f. 209
xxiv. 5–9 199 f.
xxvi. 1, 30 198

NUMBERS

i.–iv. 155
i. f. 155, 156
i. 21 163
i. 23 166, 168
i. 25 165
i. 27 163
i. 33 166
i. 35 166
i. 39 168
i. 46 165
ii. f. 93
ii. 156
ii. 6 166
ii. 11 166
ii. 15 165
ii. 16 166
ii. 17 101 f.
ii. 32 165
iii. 155
iii. 12 157
iii. 22 168
iii. 43 155
v. 9 f. 208 f.
vi. 19 212
ix. 6–14 207 f.
ix. 10 222
ix. 15 ff. 82
ix. 17 ff. 88
ix. 17 86
x. 95, 156
x. 2 161
x. 11 123, 137
x. 21 91
x. 29 106
x. 33 91
x. 34 ff. 91 f.
x. 34 87 f.
x. 36 160
xi. 1–32 94
xi. 1–3 96 *n.*
xi. 4–35 96 *n.*
xi. 4–34 109–113
xi. 4–10 111
xi. 4 ff. 97 *n.*
xi. 4–6 109
xi. 6–9 94, 95
xi. 10–15 108
xi. 10–12 110
xi. 13 111
xi. 14 112
xi. 15 110, 112
xi. 16 ff. 96 *n.*, 112
xi. 21 158, 160
xi. 24–30 91, 93, 112
xi. 25 88
xi. 26 101 f.
xi. 27 101 f.
xi. 28 66, 69 f.
xi. 30 101 f.
xi. 31 95
xi. 33, 34 95
xi. 35 95
xii. 94, 130
xii. 1 60, 99
xii. 4 ff. 93
xii. 4 91, 100 f.
xii. 5 82, 88, 100 f., 102
xii. 10 88, 101
xii. 16 129
xiii. ff. 95
xiii. f. 129
xiii. 123, 130
xiii. 2 139
xiii. 3 129, 139
xiii. 6 142
xiii. 17–20 139
xiii. 17 139
xiii. 20 129
xiii. 21 ff. 140
xiii. 21 139, 140
xiii. 22–24 139
xiii. 24 141
xiii. 26 139
xiii. 27–31 139
xiii. 29 141
xiii. 30–xiv. 1 141
xiii. 30 ff. 123, 141
xiii. 30 139, 141
xiii. 32 139, 142
xiii. 33 139
xiv. 130, 138
xiv. 4 141
xiv. 6 f. 139
xiv. 7 142
xiv. 11–24 139
xiv. 14 88
xiv. 21 90

xiv. 23 ff. 123
xiv. 24 139
xiv. 25 119, 123, 125
xiv. 26–35 139
xiv. 33 126
xiv. 38 139
xiv. 40–43 123
xiv. 44 f. 119
xiv. 44 91
xiv. 45 122, 129
xv. 130
xv. 32 130
xvi.–xviii. 130
xvi. 143
xvi. 3 144
xvi. 7 144
xvi. 9 144
xvi. 13 144
xvi. 14 130
xvi. 24 144, 145
xvi. 27 144, 145
xvii. 130
xvii. 14 (xvi. 49) 161
xvii. 28 (13) 67
xviii. 16 158
xviii. 22 67
xix. 130, 170
xx. 104, 133, 137, 160, 161
xx. 1–13 156
xx. 1 116, 120, 123, 127 f., 130, 137, 140
xx. 2–13 130
xx. 3 130
xx. 8 f. 130
xx. 12 123, 137
xx. 14–21 130
xx. 14 117
xx. 21 121
xx. 22–xxi. 4 128
xx. 22–29 128, 130, 137
xx. 22 121, 123, 125, 130, 136, 137
xx. 23 123, 124, 128, 129
xx. 29 129, 134, 135
xxi. 1–3 121, 128, 129, 130, 134
xxi. 1 122
xxi. 3 122
xxi. 4–9 130
xxi. 4 120, 121, 123, 125, 128, 129, 130, 134, 135, 136
xxi. 5–9 134
xxi. 10–20 134
xxi. 10 128
xxi. 11 ff. 135
xxi. 11 124
xxi. 12 124
xxi. 13 124
xxi. 21–25 134
xxi. 32 134
xxi. 33–35 134
xxii. 1 135
xxii. 2–xxiv. 135
xxii. 5 146
xxii. 20 f. 146
xxii. 22 147
xxiii. 10 160
xxv. 1–3 135
xxv. 9 135, 161
xxvi. 135, 155, 156, 157
xxvi. 10 145
xxvi. 47 168
xxvi. 62 156
xxvii. 3 144, 146
xxvii. 13 f. 137
xxviii. f. 199 f., 202 *n.*, 207
xxviii. 3–8 201 f.
xxviii. 8 201 f.
xxviii. 26 210
xxxi. 76 f., 169 ff.
xxxi. 4 f. 161
xxxi. 7 77
xxxi. 18 99 *n.*, 170
xxxi. 19–24 170
xxxi. 25–30 170
xxxi. 32–54 161
xxxi. 37–40 167
xxxii. 126, 127, 142
xxxii. 8 126, 139
xxxii. 9 140
xxxii. 12 142
xxxii. 13 126
xxxii. 14 172 *n.*
xxxii. 19 172 *n.*
xxxii. 32 172 *n.*
xxxiii. 116, 117, 126, 136 f., 147
xxxiii. 18 127
xxxiii. 30–31 127 *n.*
xxxiii. 35 f. 126
xxxiii. 36 127, 130
xxxiii. 37 124, 127, 128, 130, 137
xxxiii. 38 f. 128
xxxiii. 38 130, 133, 134, 135
xxxiii. 40 122, 130
xxxiii. 52 198
xxxv. 14 172 *n.*

DEUTERONOMY

i. f. 117
i. 3 134, 135
i. 19 123

i. 22–25 123
i. 26 123
i. 33 87
i. 35 f. 123
i. 37–38 137
i. 37 123
i. 39 137
i. 40 123, 125
i. 41–44 123
i. 45 123
i. 46 123, 127 f., 137
ii. 1 123, 125, 128, 137, 138
ii. 3 123
ii. 4–8 123
ii. 4 128
ii. 8 f. 124
ii. 13 f. 124
ii. 14 125, 137, 138
ii. 18 ff. 124
ii. 24 124
ii. 26 135
iii. 4 134
iii. 5 134
iii. 8 172 *n.*
iii. 20 172 *n.*
iii. 25 172 *n.*
iii. 26 137
iv. 21 137
iv. 28 222
ix. 9 148
ix. 14 149
ix. 15–16 150
ix. 15 149
ix. 17 150
ix. 18–20 150, 151, 152
ix. 21 150, 152
ix. 22 96 *n.*, 150
ix. 23 150
ix. 24 150
ix. 25–29 149
ix. 25 150
ix. 26–29 149, 150, 152
x. 150
x. 1–4 152
x. 3 150
x. 6 f. 147
x. 6 67, 68
x. 8 f. 147
xi. 6 144
xi. 10 171
xi. 30 172 *n.*
xii. 195–197
xii. 1 221
xii. 9 190
xii. 13, 14 194, 197
xii. 15 175
xii. 21 193
xvi. 212 *n.*
xvi. 3 214 *n.*
xvi. 4, 8 213 f.
xvi. 6 213
xvi. 21 f. 180
xvi. 21 192, 196
xxi. 10–14 99 *n.*, 170
xxii. 7 184 *n.*
xxiii. 5 (4) 171 *n.*
xxiv. 8 215
xxiv. 9 172 *n.*
xxv. 17 172 *n.*
xxvi. 1 ff. 209 *n.*
xxviii. 36 222
xxviii. 58 48
xxviii. 64 222
xxxi. 14 f. 70, 93, 96 f.
xxxi. 15 82
xxxi. 19 66
xxxii. 50 f. 137
xxxiii. 8 68
xxxiii. 10 68, 215

JOSHUA

iii. f. 92
iii. 3 69
iii. 6 69
iii. 14 69
iv. 13 162
vi. 92, 161
vi. 4–9 69
vi. 12 69
vi. 13 69
vi. 20 69
vii. 161
vii. 6 92
viii. 3 161
viii. 12 161
viii. 25 161
viii. 30 ff. 193
ix. 23 183 f.
ix. 27 183 f.
xiv. 6 142
xiv. 14 142
xviii. 28 173
xxi. 4–7 158
xxii. 198
xxiv. 5 65

JUDGES

v. 8 157
vi. 211
vi. 19 176

xi. 16 ff. 127
xi. 17 117, 128, 172 *n.*
xiii. 17 f. 52
xvii. f. 190 *n.*
xviii. 158
xix. 10, 11 173
xx. 2 158
xx. 17 158

1 Samuel

ii. 205 f.
ii. 1 12
ii. 15–17 211
ii. 16 191
ii. 27–36 189
vi. 19 166
viii. 13 178 *n.*
ix. 12–25 190 f.
x. 5, 13 190 f.
xiii. 5 163
xx. 6 186
xx. 29 186
xxi. 188
xxi. 7 (6) 189
xxv. 11 176
xxvi. 19 223 f.
xxviii. 24 175, 176
xxx. 24 f. 170

2 Samuel

vi. 17 188
vii. 2 12
x. 8 140
xxiv. 9 158, 167

1 Kings

i. 50 f. 182
ii. 28 ff. 182
iii. 2–4 192
viii. 64 182 *n.*
ix. 25 210
xii. 22 12
xii. 26 ff. 225 *n.*
xii. 32 f. 212 f.
xviii. 29 200 f.
xviii. 30 197
xviii. 36 200 f.
xix. 10, 14 197
xix. 21 175, 176

2 Kings

iii. 20 201, 202
xvi. 15 200 f.
xviii. 4 197 f.
xviii. 22 197 f.
xxiii. 15 198

Isaiah

ix. 2 210
xix. 225
xxii. 13 178 *n.*
xxx. 27 48
xxxvi. 7 198
l. 10 48

Jeremiah

vii. 12 189
vii. 22 217
xvi. 13 222, 225, 226 *n.*

Ezekiel

xliii. 17 180 *n.*

Hosea

iii. 4 f. 224
ix. 3, 4 224 f.

Amos

iii. 14 182

Zephaniah

iii. 4 217 *n.*

Malachi

i. 6 ff. 48

Psalms

xx. 1 f. 48
cxxiv. 8 48

Nehemiah

x. 34 (33) 200 f., 202

1 Chronicles

xvii. 1 12

2 Chronicles

xi. 2 12
xiii. 3 167

INDEX II.

SUBJECTS

Aaron, 64–70, 71 f., 74, 99 *n.*; death of, 116 f., 124, 128, 133, 134, 137, 147.
Abbreviations in MSS., 38, 41*n.*, 46, 162 f., 166, 167.
Abiram, 130, 132, 143–146.
Abraham, date of, 174.
Addis, 180.
"All," 76 f., 170.
Altar, before the Ark, 182; the great, 201; horned, 181–184, 193, 198; lay, 175, 179–182, 183, 185 f., 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200; of burnt-offering, 181, 199; steps of, 180; Temple, 180 *n.*, 182 *n.*; *see also* "Sanctuaries."
Amalek, 105 f., 172 *n.*
Angel of God, 45, 83 f.
Aquila, 16, 20.
Arad, 121 f., 128, 129 f., 131, 132, 134, 138.
Aram-naharaim, 136.
Ark, the, custody of, 68 f.; making of, 152–154; position of, 90–93.
Article, the Hebrew, 97 f.
Ashkelon, 132.
Astruc, 5, 10 *n.*, 41.
"At that time," 147, 172 *n.*

Bacon, 108, 111.
Baentsch, 77.
Balaam, 135, 136, 146 f., 172 *n.*
Bamah, 190, 191, 192, 198; *see also* High Place.
Beth-Rehob, 140.
"Beyond Jordan," 172 *n.*
Bikkurim, 183, 209 *n.*, 210.
Blayney, 36.
Boiling, 211 f.
Booty, law of, 170.
Brooke, A. E., 24 *n.*
Burney, C. F., 176 *n.*
Burnt-offerings, 194, 195, 197, 200–202; *see also* Offerings, Sacrifice.

Caleb, 123, 139, 141, 142 f.
Calendar, charge of, 216 f.
Cambridge Septuagint, the larger, 14, 16 *n.*, 22, 23, 24, 77 *n.*, 165.
Carpenter, J. Estlin, 3 *n.*, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 28, 41, 43, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 96, 98, 99 *n.*, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110 f., 113, 126, 138, 141, 172 *n.*, 173, 192.
Charu, 132.
Cheyne, 140.
Chronicles, 12, 167.
Chronology, 85 f., 97 *n.*, 98, 99, 110, 125, 129, 133–136, 137, 138, 149–154, 171 *n.*, 172 *n.*
Clodd, E., 49, 56.
Cloud, the, 82–90, 100, 101, 106 f.
Clue to the documents, the, 4–44.
Colenso, 134 f., 157, 160, 169, 173.
"Composition of the Hexateuch, the," 3 *n.*, 90 f.; *see also* Carpenter, Oxford Hexateuch.
Conflate readings, 30, 38, 165 f.
Cush, Cushite, 60, 63, 99.

D, 4, 58 *n.*, 59 *n.*, 88, 120, 126, 198, 200, 202, 204, 208, 209, 214, 215, 220.
Dahse, J., 10 *n.*, 23 *n.*
Daiches, S., 173 *n.*
Dathan, 129, 132, 143–146.
Day, how reckoned, 213 f.
De Rossi, 10 *n.*, 14 f.
Deuteronomy, composition of, 4; influence on literature, 219 f.; interpretation of, 219; Mosaic authorship of, 173; purpose of, 216, 217; *see also* D and the Index of Texts.
Dillmann, 100, 108, 192.
Dittography, 38, 91.
Documentary theory, 3–44; *see*

also Carpenter, D, Deuteronomy, Driver, E, Gray, J, JE, P, Ph, Wellhausen.
Doublets, 104 f., 109 f.
Drink-offerings, 201.
Driver, S. R., 3, 27, 28, 43, 97, 98, 108, 114, 127, 132, 137, 147, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, 162, 171 *n.*, 172 *n.*, 175, 187 *n.*, 192.

E, 3 f., 5, 6, 7, 9, 37 *n.*, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 96, 97, 99, 100, 103, 104, 109, 111, 113, 160, 161, 183, 184, 188, 199 *n.*, 215, 220; *see also* JE.
Edom, compassing of, 120, 121, 123, 125 ff., 128, 131, 133, 134; passage through, 123, 124, 128; proposed journey through, 119 ff., 127, 129 f., 131, 136, 171 *n.*
Egypt; *see* Goshen.
Elath, 128, 130.
Elders, the seventy, 96 *n.*, 113.
Eleazar, 67, 68, 69.
Elephantine papyri, 220–226.
Elohim, 5–44.
Engelkemper, W., 178 *n.*
Eshcol, 123, 140.
Eusebius, 20 *n.*, 21.
Ezekiel, 180 *n.*, 200.
Ezion-geber, 115, 126 f., 128, 130, 133.
Ezra, 171, 219.

Field, 16 *nn.*, 22, 28.
First-fruits, 206 f., 209; *see also* *Bikkurim*, *Reshith*.
Firstlings, 184 *n.*, 207, 208 f.
Frazer, J. G., 48, 49, 50, 51, 53 *n.*

Gad, numbers of, 165 f.
Gesenius, 79.
Gezer, 132.
Gideon, ephod of, 190 *n.*; sacrifice by, 211; slaughter by, 176.
Giesebrecht, 51.
Ginsburg, C. D., 162 *n.*
Girdlestone, R. B., 167.
Glory of the Lord, the, 84, 86, 90.
Glosses, 18 f., 38 *n.*, 99 *n.*, 122, 130, 144 f., 171, 172 *n.*
Goshen, 57–60.
Graf, 179.
Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, 10 *n.*, 176 *n.*, 197, 220; *see also* Higher Criticism, Wellhausen.
Gray, G. B., 3, 12, 76, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 97 *n.*, 99 *n.*, 100, 101, 114, 116, 117 *n.*, 121, 133 *n.*, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 155, 158, 161, 169, 200, 201 *n.*, 202.
Green, W. H., 72, 78, 102.

H; *see* Ph.
Harford-Battersby, G., 3 *n.*
Hastings, 185, 193.
Hazeroth, 127.
Hebrew MSS., 10, 11, 14, 165, 166; *see also* Abbreviations, Septuagint, Textual Criticism.
"Hebrew, The," 16.
Hesychius, 20, 21, 22.
Hexapla, 20 f.
High Place, 182 *n.*, 196, 197 f.; *see also* *Bamah*.
High Priest, 99 *n.*, 170.
Higher Criticism, 1–44, 215; *see also* Carpenter, Colenso, D, Deuteronomy, Driver, E, Gray, J, JE, P, Ph, Wellhausen.
Hoerning, R., 15 *n.*, 41 *n.*
Hogarth, D. G., 132.
Holland, 133.
Holmes, 24, 165.
Holy, 208 f.
Homoeoteleuton, 104, 126 f., 145,
Hor, Mount, 116, 121, 123, 124, 128, 134, 135, 136, 137, 147.
Horeb, 60; departure from, 99, 123.
Hormah, 119, 121 f., 127, 129, 131, 132, 138.
House of God, 182, 183, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 200, 205 f., 208; *see also* Nob, Shiloh.
House of the Lord; *see* House of God.
Hundred, 167.
Huntington, E., 115.

Ingathering, Feast of; *see* Tabernacles.
Investigation, principles of, 117 f.
Ishmael, 17.
Israel stele, 131 f.

Israelites, intellectual condition of, in Mosaic age, 47, 53; *see also* Goshen, Numbers, Wanderings.
Itinerary, the, 117 f., 122, 126, 136 f., 147.

J, 3 f., 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 71, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106, 109, 111, 117, 159, 160, 161, 183, 184, 188, 205, 206, 220; *see also* JE.
Jaazer, spying out, 134 f.
JE, 3 f., 59 *n.*, 73, 83, 92, 108, 109, 110, 117, 119, 120, 121, 126, 127, 139, 140, 158, 159, 161, 192, 198, 200, 202, 204, 208, 209, 210, 217; *see also* E, J.
Jethro, 60 f., 62, 98.
Joshua, 105, 106, 139, 142; alleged priesthood of 65, 66–70.
Judges, 96 *n.*, 106 f., 113.
Justice, administration of, 99 f., 106, 187 *n.*

Kadesh, 116 f., 118, 119, 120–138, 139, 148, 171 *n.*, 172 *n.*
Kautzsch, 108.
Kedemoth, wilderness of, 135.
Kennedy, A. R. S., 185.
Kennicott, B., 14, 15, 36, 37 *n.*, 38 *n.*, 164 *n.*, 165, 166, 168.
King, 174.
Kittel, 14, 42, 62, 77, 178 *n.*
Klostermann, 28.
Korah, 143–146.
Kuenen, 153.

Lagarde, P. de, 23, 28, 77, 122, 162.
Laws, 43, 171; groups of, in Pentateuch, 216; how construed, 194; some, only to reach the people through the priests, 206, 215 f.; *see also* Altar, Booty, Burnt-offerings, Legislation, Offerings, Sacrifice.
Leavened Cakes, 214.
Legislation, the, intended for a people, settled in a fixed territory, 221 ff.; Mosaic, 215; *see also* Laws.
Levi, Levites; *see* Numbers, Priests.
Literary evidence, the so-called, 58 *n.*, 59 *n.*, 78–81.
Lucian, Lucianic Recension, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 168; *see also* Textual Criticism.

McLean, N., 24 *n.*
Maine, Sir Henry, 226.
Manna, narratives, 97 *n.*, 103 f., 109, 111–113; pot of, 85, 86.
Marriages with foreigners, 99 *n.*, 170 f.
Massah and Meribah, 104.
Massoretes, the, 11.
Massoretic Text; *see* Textual Criticism.
Meal-offerings, 200–202.
Merenptah, 132.
Meribah; *see* Kadesh, Massah.
Micah, image of, 190 *n.*
Midian, 76 f., 135, 169–171.
Miriam, 99 *n.*, 172 *n.*
Mistranslations, 101, 184 *n.*, 207.
Moab, message to, 172 *n.*; wilderness of, 124.
Months, numbered before the Exile, 213.
Moserah, 147.
Moses, 52 f., 54–56, 60–66, 74, 99, 105 f., 111–113, 116, 119, 120, 137, 152, 171–173; fasting of, 148 f.; sons of, 60, 61 f., 63 f.; visits to the Mount, 148–152; wife of, 60, 61, 63; *see also* Jethro, Rod, Zipporah.
Mountain of God, 70 f.; *see also* Horeb.
Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, 10 *n.*, 47 *n.*, 182, 209 *n.*

Names, objective existence of, 47 f., 51; primitive ideas as to, 48–56; *see also* Tetragrammaton.
Nash papyrus, 10 *n.*
Negeb, 121.
Nehemiah, 154 *n.*, 171.
Nob, 187, 188, 189, 190, 202.
Nöldeke, 220.
Numbers, the, 155–169, 170.

Oboth, 128, 130, 136.
Offerings, classified, 196, 199 f., 219; National, 199–202; Statutory individual, 205, 206, 209, 210; *see also* Sacrifice.
Og, campaign against, 134 f.

Origen, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30.
Oxford Hexateuch, 2 f., 5, 6, 12, 13, 28, 57, 58 *n.*, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82 f., 84, 88, 90 f., 93 f., 102 f., 105, 107, 108, 110 f., 113, 126, 137, 173 *n.*; *see also* Carpenter, Composition of the Hexateuch.

P, 4, 5, 7, 9, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 57, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105 *n.*, 107, 108, 109, 116, 117, 126, 136, 137, 139, 140, 142, 143, 158, 159, 161, 192, 198, 199, 200, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222; *see also* Ph.
Pamphilus, 20 *n.*, 21.
Paran, wilderness of, 120, 129, 139.
Passover, Feast of, 183, 184 *n.*, 194 f., 206, 207 f., 212, 213 f., 222.
Peace-offerings, 195, 211 f.
Pentateuch, the, authorship of, 42 f., 171–174; transmission of, 118; *see also* D, Deuteronomy, E, J, JE, P, Ph, Wellhausen.
Pentecost; *see* Weeks.
Pethor, 136, 146.
Ph, 4, 79, 198, 209, 218.
Pilgrimage festivals, 183, 206 f., 210, 222; their dates, 212 f.; *see also* Passover, Tabernacles, Weeks.
Pillar of Cloud; *see* Cloud.
Pitru, 136, 146.
Plagues, the, 72–78.
Plural verbs, alternation of singular and, 65 f.
Prayer, 221.
Pre-Mosaic materials in Pentateuch, 42 f.
Priesthood, Priests, 66–70, 107, 181, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 216 f., 218 f.; garb of priests, 180; *see also* Aaron, Altar, House of God, Offering, Sacrifice, Teaching.
Procedure, 203–206, 209, 210, 215, 217.
Quails, 97 *n.*, 109 f., 111–113.

Ransom of souls, 163 f.
Rd, 4, 59 *n.*, 79, 92, 160.
Red Sea, the, crossing of, 82, 102 f.; journey by, 119, 120, 123, 125, 133, 134, 136.
Redpath, H. A., 10 *n.*, 41 *n.*
Rehob, 140.
Reland, 121.
Reshith, 209 f., 214.
Rje, 3 f., 37 *n.*, 58 *n.*, 59 *n.*, 60, 81, 83, 88, 90.
Robinson, 156.
Rod, the, 70–72, 75, 77.
Rowlands, 131, 133.
Rp, 4, 58, 81, 88, 103.

Sacrifice, 189 f., 221–226; and slaughter, 175–178, 193; at *bamoth*, 192; clan, 186; customary lay, 179, 185 f., 187, 191, 194, 195 f., 197, 205; how prepared, 211; only possible in the national territory in Mosaic times and for long after, 221 ff.; Naaman's device, 223, 226; Hosea's view, 224 f.; Jeremiah's, 225, 226 *n.*; solutions of the difficulty, 226; prophetic denunciations of, 217 f.; statutory individual, 192, 195, 196 f., 202 *n.*, 205, 206; with priestly assistance, 191, 206; *see also* Offerings.
Salem, 173.
Samaritan Pentateuch, 11, 36, 153 f.
Samuel, 191.
"Sanctuaries," 175, 179, 185, 186 f., 188.
Sanctuary, ministry of, 66–70; what is, 180; *see also* Altar, House of God, Tabernacle.
Scribes, bias of, 168 f.
Septuagint, the, 11, 13, 14, 15–42, 127 *n.*, 153 f., 162, 164, 167; history of, 20 f.; how to use, 13, 22, 24 f., 30, 37 f.; *see also* Cambridge Septuagint, Lucian, Textual Criticism.
Shewbread, 188, 202, 214.
Shiloh, 187, 189, 190, 210, 211.
Sihon, campaign against, 134 f.; message to, 134 f.
Singular; *see* Plural.

Sin-offering, 212, 214.
Slaughter, non-sacrificial, 175–178, 193; of statutory individual sacrifice, 206 *n.*
Smith, H. P., 178 *n.*
Smith, W. R., 153 f., 177 *n.*, 187 *n.*, 197.
Spies, mission of the, 123, 129, 131, 138–143.
Strack, 97.
Substantive law, 203–205, 206.
Swete, 77.
Symmachus, 16, 20, 21.
Syriac Version, 12.
"Syrian, the," 16.

Taberah, 96 *n.*
Tabernacle, the, 91, 161, 199; making of, 93, 153 f., 164 *n.*; ministry of, 65, 66–70; position of, 93–102; service of, 154 *n.*; *see also* Altar, Tent of Meeting.
Tabernacles, Feast of, 183, 209 *n.*, 210 f., 212 f.
Teaching of the priest, 206, 215 f., 218, 219.
Tent of Meeting, 69, 89 *n.*, 91, 93, 96–102, 107 f.; *see also* Tabernacle.
Terumah, 208 f.
Tetragrammaton, the, 4, 46 f., 52–56, 173 f., 184 *n.*, 189 *n.*; importance of, to the documentary theory, 4–44; revelation of, 4, 41 f., 46, 53–56; use of, 5–41, 45.
Textual criticism, 10–42, 44–46, 62 f., 83 *n.*, 85, 90 *n.*, 91, 94–96, 97 f., 101, 103 f., 106, 107, 108, 114, 121–138, 140 f., 145–146, 147, 149, 153 f., 162–169, 172 *n.*
Theodotion, 20, 21.
Theophany, 185 f.
Thirty-eight years, the, how reckoned, 124.
Thousand, undue insertion or omission of, 166 f.
Tithes, 210.
Transliteration of Hebrew, 116 *n.*
Trumbull, H. C., 131 f., 133.
Tylor, E. B., 49.

Van Hoonacker, A., 69, 70, 94–96, 184 *n.*
Versions, the, 11, 13 ff.; *see also* Septuagint, Textual Criticism.

Wanderings of the Israelites, 94–96, 114, 116–138; region of, 115.
Water episodes, 104 f., 119 f., 133, 137, 138, 148, 156, 160.
Weeks, Feast of, 183, 210; *see also* Pilgrimage festivals.
Wellhausen, 1, 3, 10 *n.*, 90, 116, 177, 178, 179, 180, 184, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 197, 198, 200, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209 *nn.*, 210, 211, 212 *n.*, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219, *see also* Graf-Wellhausen.
"When ye came forth out of Egypt," 171 *n.*
Wright, G. F., 115.
Writing, Hebrew, 46, 162 f., 166; *see also* Abbreviations.

Yenoam, 132.

Zered, the, crossing of, 124, 125, 137.
Zin, wilderness of, 116, 120 f., 139.
Zipporah, 61, 63, 99 *n.*, 170.

DATE DUE

BS
1225
.W6

13,734

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS1225.W6
Wiener, Harol Essays in Pentateuchal cri
3 0645 0002 8791 8